

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The decision as to the degree of punishment is dictated by the judge—and rightly so.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The important thing is that the verdict is reached by the jury.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: But the degree of punishment is dictated by the judge. When we speak of the verdict of a jury we refer to the voice of a number of citizens. The decision is not reached by one person. I do not know whether I am sticking my neck out or not, but I cannot see why it should be necessary for the health of an individual to be looked after by a qualified man, yet in matters of law his interests can be looked after by a man who is not legally qualified. I would point out that I have no ill feeling towards any of our present magistrates, but I do not like the principle. I think it is one that should be looked at. If we are going to attract people to the legal profession, I think we have to ensure that there is a sufficient number of suitable posts for them.

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: In this case you mentioned that the police could have appealed against the magistrate's decision if they thought it was justified.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: They could have done.

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: The fact that they did not appeal indicates that they did not share your views.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The Minister has promised to let me have a look at the file, and that might satisfy me entirely. I have aired my views on the matter.

In conclusion, I would like to wish the new members of this House a happy term of office. I am sure that their contributions to the debates of this House will be readily acceptable.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. E. M. Heenan.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [8.2 p.m.]: I move—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until 4 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).

May I say, in explanation, that we amended Standing Orders last session to provide for the House to sit on Thursdays at 2.30 p.m. However, I feel that the noise resulting from the present building operations may be of such a nature that the deliberations of this House could be severely interfered with. These building operations are necessary, and if we sit at 4 p.m. instead of 2.30 p.m. we will not have such a prolonged period of interference.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Then let us make more noise in here to counteract the noise outside.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There are some people who do that already.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 8.2 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 1st August, 1962

CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Cockburn Cement Pty. Ltd.: Tabling of Agreement with Government	105
Commonwealth Games Village: Cost of Homes	105
Crown Land—	
Acreage Released and Occupied	104
Nullarbor Plain Allocations and Rental	104
Eastern Goldfields High School: New Gymnasium	100
Eastern Goldfields Technical School—Cleaners and Gardeners: Changing and Shower Facilities	101
"Education Circular": Late Arrival of June Issue at Kalgoorlie	100
Fish: Weight of Catches	99
Government Car Drivers—	
Drivers of Ministerial Cars	105
Hours Worked	104
Medical Examinations	104
Miles Travelled	104
Hannan Street Railway Crossing: Installation of Traffic Lights	101
Herriok, Harold James: Trial—Action for an Appeal	103
Houses at Carnarvon—	
Allocations and Building, 1961-1962	99
Allocations for 1962-1963	99
Housing for Natives: Provision at Carnarvon	98
Kalgoorlie Infants' School—Oslo Lunch Centre: Government Subsidy	101
Kindergarten Union of W.A.: Government Grant	102
Law Reform Act: Provisions of Section 4	102
Married Women's Rights: Claims for Loss of Consortium	100
Metropolitan Urban Land: Minimum Area—Tabling of Papers on Investigation	105
Mine Workers' Relief Fund: Contributions by Beneficiaries	101
Parliament House Additions: Tabling of Files	98
Powers of Attorney: Protection for Agents	99
School Bus Services: Medical Examinations for Drivers	104

CONTENTS—*continued*

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—<i>continued</i>	
School Sporting Facilities : Government Assistance	98
Shipping at Carnarvon : Inquiry by Transport Board	99
Sir James Mitchell Park : Classification as a Reserve	103
Standard Gauge Railway : Kalgoorlie to Perth Route	104
Taxation : Group Certificates—Issuance to Teachers	101
Teachers : Salary Increases	102
Uncollected Goods : Legislation Governing Disposal	100
Western Australian Legislation : Consolidation of Statutes	100
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—	
Iron Ore—	
Export Overseas : Tabling of Correspondence	105
Mt. Goldsworthy Deposits : Ratification of Agreement for Development	105
Unemployment—	
Position in Western Australia	106
Appointment of Special Officer	106
COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION—	
Appointment in Assembly	106
Council's Message	106
STANDING ORDERS—	
Motion to Suspend	106
ORDERS OF THE DAY—	
Postponement of Nos. 1 and 2	109
ADDRESS-IN-REPLY : SECOND DAY—	
Speakers on Motion—	
Mr. Bickerton	122
Mr. Hawke	113
Mr. Tonkin	127

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**PARLIAMENT HOUSE ADDITIONS***Tabling of Files*

1. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Works:

Would he lay on the Table of the House the files dealing with—

- the calling for tenders for the completion of Parliament House;
- the successful tenderer, C. B. & M. Wildy, Pty. Ltd., showing amendments made since the contract was let to this firm?

Mr. WILD replied:

As these are active files, the honourable member may peruse same at my office at his convenience.

SCHOOL SPORTING FACILITIES*Government Assistance*

2. Mr. H. MAY asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will he supply a list of all metropolitan schools, which have been assisted by his department by way of finance in connection with the establishment of sports grounds and sporting facilities in any way, showing the amounts of finance made available?
- (2) Likewise, will he supply similar information regarding the principal country towns of Western Australia?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) and (2) The information requested by the honourable member will necessitate a tremendous amount of research. The Education Department does not keep records of the assistance given as it is done by the Public Works Department.

There would be more than 200 schools involved in the question, so the honourable member will realise how much work is entailed and will understand that it would take several weeks.

If he would like figures obtained for any particular school or schools, I should be glad to provide the information.

HOUSING FOR NATIVES*Provision at Carnarvon*

3. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) Is it intended to build the five houses for coloured people at Carnarvon as allocated after the cyclone in 1960?
- (2) Is he aware that these five houses were to have been completed and occupied before the end of December, 1960?
- (3) If the answer to No. (1) is "No," what is the intention of his department in respect of native housing at Carnarvon?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Yes, if still required.
- (2) Yes, subject to the land having become available in time.
- (3) The houses as required will be erected as soon as the land survey is finalised.

SHIPPING AT CARNARVON*Inquiry by Transport Board*

4. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Transport:
- (1) Did an officer of the Transport Board visit Carnarvon recently to get information regarding the tonnage of cargo carried to and from that port on State ships?
 - (2) If so, from whom was the information obtained?
 - (3) Was the investigation confined to the cargoes carried, or was other information sought; and, if so, what was it?
 - (4) For what purpose was this information required?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) No. Two officers visited the Onslow-Port Hedland-Marble Bar area to make inquiries regarding transport.
- (2) When passing through Carnarvon general shipping arrangements were discussed briefly with the wharfinger.
- (3) The purpose of the visit was concerned with areas further north than Carnarvon.
- (4) Answered by No. (3).

FISH*Weight of Catches*

5. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Fisheries:

What was the weight of fish caught (excluding those used for canning) during the years—

1958-59;

1959-60;

1960-61;

in the areas of—

- (a) Shark Bay;
- (b) Geraldton;
- (c) Fremantle;
- (d) Mandurah;
- (e) Bunbury;
- (f) Busselton;
- (g) Albany?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

	1958-59.	1959-60.	1960-61.
	lb.	lb.	lb.
Shark Bay	1,687,300	3,290,500	3,051,700
Geraldton	7,325,500	7,270,500	8,075,000
Fremantle	13,111,800	13,336,200	10,798,800
Mandurah	770,500	843,000	1,170,700
Bunbury and Busselton	1,078,400	1,031,400	953,800
Albany	806,600	397,800	198,800
Includes crayfish, prawns and scallops.			

HOUSES AT CARNARVON*Allocations and Building, 1961-1962*

6. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:
- (1) How many houses were allocated to Carnarvon for the year 1961-62?
 - (2) How many were built?
 - (3) If the total number of houses allocated were not built, what was the reason?

Allocations for 1962-1963

- (4) How many houses has the Housing Commission allocated for Carnarvon for the year 1962-63?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Twelve houses, and tenders were to be called at intervals in groups of four houses, if warranted.
- (2) Four houses.
- (3) There were 12 applications only, and a vacancy rate of 14 houses per annum.
- (4) Twelve houses have been allocated for 1962-1963, and it is proposed to call tenders within the next few weeks for four houses and repeat at intervals as circumstances warrant.

There are now 21 applications, including wastage and a vacancy rate of 12 houses per annum.

POWERS OF ATTORNEY*Protection for Agents*

7. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:
- (1) Is there any legislative provision in this State, similar to section 124 (1) of the Imperial Law of Property Act, 1925, protecting agents operating through powers of attorney, in cases where the principal dies or becomes bankrupt, unknown to the agent?
 - (2) If not, has there been any felt need for such legislation in this State?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) There is no legislative provision in this State similar in terms to section 124, subsection (1) of the Imperial Law of Property Act, 1925, but attention is invited to the Powers of Attorney Act, 1896, section 6, and Transfer of Land Act, 1893-1959, section 143.
- (2) I have not heard of any need for legislation similar to the Imperial provision.

MARRIED WOMEN'S RIGHTS*Claims for Loss of Consortium*

8. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Following the decision of the High Court of Australia in *Wright v. Cedzich*, 43 CLR, 493, has consideration been given to introducing legislation in this State to clarify the position of the married woman's right to claim the loss of consortium of her husband, in keeping with contemporary social demands and modern ideas re emancipation of married women?

Mr. COURT replied:

No recommendation has been received for legislation for the purpose mentioned.

9. *This question was postponed.*

UNCOLLECTED GOODS*Legislation Governing Disposal*

10. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Is there an enactment in this State concerning the subject matter covered by the Imperial Disposal of Uncollected Goods Act, 1952?
- (2) If not, has any consideration been given to introducing similar legislation in this State?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) No; but the matter will be considered.

"EDUCATION CIRCULAR"*Late Arrival of June Issue at Kalgoorlie*

11. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware that the *June Education Circular* of date the 7th June, 1962, did not arrive at one goldfields school at least, until the 28th June?
- (2) Is it a fact that the information contained in this circular is usually incorporated in the circular published in May?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Yes.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN LEGISLATION*Consolidation of Statutes*

12. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Will he give consideration to having the following statutes consolidated into volumes:—

- (a) Local Courts Act, 1904;
- (b) Land Tax Assessment Act, 1907-1960;
- (c) Mine Workers' Relief Act?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (a) The Local Courts Act, 1904-1958, has been reprinted with amendments up to date and is now available in a separate volume that also includes the Local Court Rules, 1961, and index to the Act and rules.
- (b) The Land Tax Assessment Act, 1907-1960 was reprinted in 1960 with all amendments up to and including Act No. 33 of 1959. There has been one amendment since the reprint, Act No. 68 of 1960. As the reprinted Act with the one amendment is easy to read and there are large stocks of the reprinted Act on hand, it is considered that a further reprint at this stage is unwarranted.
- (c) The Mine Workers' Relief Act, 1932-1961 was approved for reprint on the 19th June, 1962. The Government Printing Office advises it will be available to the public next week.

EASTERN GOLDFIELDS HIGH SCHOOL*New Gymnasium*

13. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Would he please advise whether consideration has been given to building a new gymnasium at Eastern Goldfields High School?
- (2) How long is it likely to be before this much-needed appointment to the school will be granted?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) The provision of gymnasiums at high schools is still under consideration.
- (2) Answered by No. (1).

HANNAN STREET RAILWAY CROSSING

Installation of Traffic Lights

14. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Railways:

Will he please give consideration to having the question of the Hannan Street, Kalgoorlie, railway crossing reopened and considered by the special committee for the installation of traffic lights, as the "Stop" signs erected there have not proved satisfactory in the opinion of motorists using the crossing and also the conference of goldfields local governing bodies?

Mr. COURT replied:

The installation of flashing lights at Hannan Street Railway Crossing was not considered warranted by the Level Crossing Protection Committee which decided that "Stop" signs would meet the situation.

An inspection of the crossing made on the 11th July disclosed that the advance warning signs were badly positioned on the Parkeston side. This aspect has been brought to the notice of the local authority which controls the signs with a view to effecting an improvement. I have asked the deputy commissioner to give consideration to the honourable member's comments made when speaking on this subject during yesterday's Supply Bill debate.

KALGOORLIE INFANTS' SCHOOL

Oslo Lunch Centre: Government Subsidy

15. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware that the Kalgoorlie Infants' Parents and Citizens' Association are anxious to receive a subsidy of £250 owing to them in respect of their Oslo lunch centre as they need this money to meet their commitments to the builders?
- (2) Will he please take steps to have this payment expedited?
- (3) When can such payment be expected?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Yes, but the subsidy given in such cases is £200 for the building.
- (2) and (3) The matter has been attended to and payment may be expected within a few days.

EASTERN GOLDFIELDS TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Cleaners and Gardeners: Changing and Shower Facilities

16. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) What number of cleaners and gardeners are engaged at the Eastern Goldfields Technical School?
- (2) What facilities exist at this school for the use of these men in the way of a change room and a shower?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Two full-time male cleaners and one full-time female cleaner. One part-time male gardener.
- (2) No special change rooms or showers are provided, but the female cleaner is permitted to use the shower in the girls' toilet block.

MINE WORKERS' RELIEF FUND

Contributions by Beneficiaries

17. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Is a person who became a beneficiary of the Mine Workers' Relief Fund as a result of the 1961 amendment to the Mine Workers' Relief Act, required to continue contributing to the fund?
- (2) If so, what section of the Mine Workers' Relief Act governs this position?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) Yes, unless the beneficiary is specifically exempt by the Mine Workers' Relief Board.
- (2) Subsection (5) of section 50 of the Mine Workers' Relief Act.

TAXATION: GROUP CERTIFICATES

Issuance to Teachers

18. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has there been any delay in issuing taxation group certificates to teachers this year; if so, what was the reason?
- (2) Is it a fact that during the period 1960-1961, some group certificates in respect of teachers were delayed as much as up to seven weeks?
- (3) What steps are being taken to ensure the prompt issuing of group certificates to teachers?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No. Approximately 10,000 group certificates and 3,000 statements of earnings were issued by the 23rd July, 1962.
- (2) No. Group certificates were issued at the end of July, 1961.

- (3) Owing to balance requirements and numbers of teachers involved group certificates cannot be issued, with present staff, until the latter half of July.

TEACHERS

Salary Increases

19. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Why is it that normal grade salary increases for teachers are not paid promptly as from the 1st January each year?
- (2) Why was the reclassification for teachers, which was due on the 1st July, 1961, not gazetted until the 18th August, 1961?
- (3) When salary scales were gazetted in August of 1961, why were the new rates not paid promptly?
- (4) Is it a fact that when the cost-of-living figure dropped in October, 1961, the reductions were effected in teachers' salaries within one month?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) It takes a great deal of time to make the necessary adjustments to teachers' salaries as—
 - (a) the majority of teachers are eligible for an increment on the 1st January each year. Increments are not automatic, and the salaries of over 5,000 teachers must be considered individually;
 - (b) the appointment of a teacher for the new school year has a bearing on the salary to be paid as district and basic allowances vary.

The officers of the staff and salaries sections of the department already work a considerable amount of overtime in order to pay increments as promptly as possible. It would not be possible to increase staff for the relatively short adjustment period as temporary help would not be expert in this field.

- (2) Because it was not ready on the 1st July, 1961.
- (3) Because the reclassification was subject to appeal to the State School Teachers' Tribunal, and it was decided that it would be preferable to wait until its decisions were known and thus avoid two adjustments to salary.
- (4) Yes. It is usual for cost-of-living adjustments to be effected within six weeks of the declaration in order that an accumulated reduction should not be made.

LAW REFORM ACT

Provisions of Section 4

20. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Is it a fact that Mr. Justice Jackson, since the enactment of the Law Reform (Contributory Negligence and Tortfeasors' Contribution) Act, 1947, has ruled that the provisions of section 4 of that Act do not affect a case brought in trespass, irrespective of whether the plaintiff was guilty of contributory negligence or not?
- (2) If so, what were the names of the litigants concerned in the case, and in what year was it decided?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) No; but Mr. Justice Jackson on the 29th July, 1960, ruled that the provisions of section 4 of the Law Reform (Contributory Negligence and Tortfeasors' Contribution) Act, 1947, do not affect a case brought in nuisance and that contributory negligence continues to be a complete defence to an action in nuisance for obstructing a highway.
- (2) The case in which the above ruling was given is reported in (1961) Western Australian Reports, page 2.

KINDERGARTEN UNION OF W.A.

Government Grant

21. Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it a fact that the total Government grant for 1961 to the Kindergarten Union of W.A. (Inc.) was £38,589?
- (2) Is it the intention of the Government to increase the grant in the current year?
- (3) If the answer to No. (2) is "Yes"—
 - (a) will the increase be sufficient to provide long-service leave and superannuation benefits for kindergarten teachers;
 - (b) will the increased grant enable a reduction in fees paid by parents of children attending Union kindergartens?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No. The total Government grant to kindergartens for 1961-62 financial year was £43,050, including £40,050 paid direct to the Kindergarten Union, £2,000 for buildings, and £1,000 to assist needy kindergartens.

- (2) Adjustments in accordance with the formula will result in an increase of approximately £3,000 in the current financial year.
- (3) (a) and (b) Not known. The manner in which the grant is spent is determined entirely by the Kindergarten Union.

TRIAL OF HAROLD JAMES HERRICK

Action for an Appeal

22. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Did he see the reported decision of the Court of Criminal Appeal that the conviction of Hendrikus Plomp on a rape charge was quashed because in the opinion of the judges Plomp had not had a fair trial because of the Crown failure to submit evidence of two witnesses?
- (2) Is he aware that at the trial of Harold James Herrick on a charge of manslaughter held in the Criminal Court, Perth, on the 25th June, the Crown did not submit the evidence of three witnesses whom it had subpoenaed and Herrick was found guilty of reckless and dangerous driving?
- (3) Is he aware that the three witnesses whose evidence was not given should be regarded as important witnesses because of their proximity to the scene of the accident when it occurred?
- (4) Is it a fact that one of the witnesses in question requested an interview with him a month ago because she was gravely concerned that a miscarriage of justice had occurred?
- (5) In the circumstances, and having regard to the decision of the Court of Criminal Appeal in the Hendrikus Plomp case, is it not possible that Herrick did not have a fair trial?
- (6) Will he have the matter inquired into so that the necessary action for an appeal can be taken if considered justified?
- (7) Should the circumstances warrant an appeal, will he arrange for the provision of counsel in accordance with the Poor Persons' Legal Assistance Act?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) to (7) The Minister for Justice saw the newspaper report of the decision of the Court of Criminal Appeal of Queensland in the Hendrikus Plomp case, but it appears

from that report that the evidence not submitted at Plomp's trial was either suppressed or not adduced through negligence. In the case of Herrick's trial, the Crown, four days before the trial, advised counsel for the defence that three of the witnesses who had given evidence at the inquest and who had been subpoenaed by the Crown to attend at the trial would not in fact be called by the Crown as witnesses at the trial, but would be available in court for calling by the defence if so required. It was then for the defence to decide whether or not the witnesses or any of them should be called for the defence. This was entirely in accord with usual practice. As it happened, however, the defence chose to call no evidence at all, even though fully aware of the availability of the witnesses and of the evidence which they had given at the inquest. Clearly, therefore, any suppression of evidence or failure to adduce evidence was the action of the defence in the exercise of a discretionary right.

One of the witnesses, subpoenaed but not called as a witness, later wrote to the Minister complaining that her evidence should have been availed of by the defence. The Minister decided to make inquiries into the circumstances before replying to that letter, bearing in mind that the accused had a right of appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal and that it is an undesirable practice for a Minister to review the finding of a jury otherwise than at the request of the defence. The defence, in fact, has made no such request or alleged to the Minister any unfairness of the trial, or given notice of any appeal. If the defence should decide to appeal, the Crown would not oppose an application to extend the time for appeal; and if circumstances should so warrant, legal aid could be provided through usual channels.

SIR JAMES MITCHELL PARK

Classification as a Reserve

23. Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Minister for Lands:

Is Sir James Mitchell Park in South Perth an "A"-class Reserve; and, if so, what are the details in regard to same?

Mr. BOVELL replied:
No.

STANDARD GAUGE RAILWAY*Kalgoorlie to Perth Route*

24. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Is there any foundation in the rumour that the proposed standard gauge railway from Kalgoorlie to Perth will be diverted from the existing railway route, somewhere between Booran and No. 7 Pumping Station, and proceed through Koolyanobbing, Bullfinch, and Campion and finally rejoin the existing line east of Kellerberrin?
- (2) If this route has not been chosen, will he indicate the exact route to be followed?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) There has been no decision to make a diversion as suggested in question No. (1). As previously announced, surveys of alternative routes in the area under question are being made, but it is yet premature to forecast any decision until the result of the survey has been carefully examined. Consequently, the exact route cannot be delineated at present.

CROWN LAND*Acreage Released and Occupied*

25. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Lands:

- (1) What total acreage of Crown land has been released and occupied during the years from 1952 to 1962 inclusive?
- (2) What acreages released in each year were regarded as suited to—
 - (a) pastoral;
 - (b) grazing in rural districts;
 - (c) cereal production;
 - (d) other purposes?

Nullarbor Plain Allocations and Rentals

- (3) Have any large areas of the Nullarbor Plain country been allocated; and if so, what area, and when released?
- (4) What rentals are payable on this country?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

A great deal of research is necessary to provide the answer to this question, and therefore I ask that it be postponed for one week. An effort is being made to obtain the information, but I cannot guarantee it will be available then.

SCHOOL BUS SERVICES*Medical Examinations for Drivers*

26. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it compulsory for drivers of school buses to undergo medical examination before appointment, or being licensed to drive school buses?
- (2) Are they compelled to have periodical medical examinations?
- (3) If the answer to No. (2) is "No," does he not think it would be advisable to have school bus drivers medically examined periodically?
- (4) If the answer to No. (3) is "Yes," would the Government be prepared to meet the cost of such medical examinations, or portion of the costs?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Answered by No. (2).
- (4) No.

GOVERNMENT CAR DRIVERS*Medical Examinations*

27. Mr. HALL asked the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware of the article in *The West Australian* of the 11th July, headed "Driver dies in hotel"?
- (2) If he is aware of the article, can he advise the House whether Government car drivers have to pass a medical examination on their appointment?
- (3) If the answer to No. (2) is "Yes," can he advise whether the drivers concerned are required to have periodical medical examinations?

Hours Worked

- (4) What are the actual hours of work that Government drivers are expected to do, ordinary time and overtime?
- (5) What were the actual hours worked by Government car drivers, on an average, under the Hawke Labor Government, for the three-year period 1956-1959?
- (6) What were the actual hours worked by the Government car drivers, under the Brand-Watts Government for the three-year period 1959-1962?

Miles Travelled

- (7) How many miles were drivers requested to drive under the Hawke Labor Government for the period 1956-1959?

- (8) How many miles were drivers requested to drive under the Brand-Watts-Nalder Government for the period 1959-1962?

Drivers of Ministerial Cars

- (9) How many drivers are employed by the W.A. Government at present with reference to car drivers of ministerial cars, and how many were employed by the Hawke Labor Government during the last three-year period of office?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No; but consideration is being given to the position. If drivers wish to join the Superannuation Fund, they must pass a medical test. The driver referred to in question No. (1) was medically examined and accepted for superannuation on the 23rd May, 1961.
- (3) Answered by No. (2).
- (4) The Industrial Arbitration Agreement under which Ministerial drivers work, provides—
 - (a) the hours workers may be called on to work without payment of overtime shall be eight hours per day, exclusive of meal times, or 40 hours per week to be worked in five days (Monday to Friday inclusive).
 - (b) the employer may require any worker to work reasonable overtime at overtime rates and such worker shall work overtime in accordance with such requirements.
- (5) and (6) This information is not available without an examination of each individual driver's weekly time sheets over the period between 1956 and 1962.
- (7) and (8) As some Government motor garage cars are driven to a considerable extent by Ministers and some by other Government employees, it is not possible without an analysis of the total mileage run for each vehicle each year to determine the mileage driven by drivers.
- (9) Number of drivers—

At present	8
Period 1956-1959	6

**METROPOLITAN URBAN LAND:
MINIMUM AREA**

Tabling of Papers on Investigation

28. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

Will he lay on the Table of the House the report and subsequent papers showing what decisions

have been made or action taken (if any) in connection with the investigation into the minimum area of holdings of urban land in the metropolitan area?

Mr. LEWIS replied:
Yes.

COMMONWEALTH GAMES VILLAGE

Cost of Homes

29. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What is the approximate average cost of the houses (excluding land) in the Commonwealth Games Village?
- (2) What is the estimated cost of—
 - (a) the cheapest;
 - (b) the dearest;
 of these homes?
- (3) When will the final figures be known?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) £5,128.
- (2) (a) £4,375.
(b) £6,468.
- (3) Late October, 1962.

COCKBURN CEMENT PTY. LTD.

Tabling of Agreement With Government

30. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Premier:
Will he lay on the Table of the House a copy of the agreement existing between the Western Australian Government and Cockburn Cement Pty. Ltd.?

Mr. BRAND replied:

It is not intended to table this agreement. The agreement is available for perusal at any time in the department concerned.

**QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE
IRON ORE**

*Export Overseas: Tabling of
Correspondence*

1. Mr. BRAND: On opening day, the Leader of the Opposition asked for the papers relating to the requests to the Commonwealth Government in respect of iron ore. I will be able to lay those papers on the Table of the House tomorrow.

*Mt. Goldsworthy Deposits: Ratification
of Agreement for Development*

2. Mr. BOVELL: With reference to the question without notice addressed by the member for Pilbara to the Minister for Industrial Development yesterday, relating to the

agreement for developing the Mt. Goldsworthy iron ore deposits. I desire to state it is intended that a Bill for ratification of the agreement be presented to Parliament this session.

Adequate opportunity will be given to examine this Bill. However, it is considered a week's adjournment would be sufficient for this purpose.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Position in Western Australia

3. Mr. HEAL asked the Premier:

- (1) Is it a fact that during the election campaign he stated that within two months we would have more than enough jobs for everyone, including both skilled and unskilled labour?
- (2) If so, would he explain to the House why, in the month of June, 1962, the W.A. registered unemployment figures rose by 310 to 5,320?

Appointment of Special Officer

- (3) In view of the above, will the Premier set up a special officer whom members of Parliament can approach to discuss the possibility of employing in Government or private jobs some of the unfortunate people who are seeking work?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) The honourable member gave me some notice of the question and informed me that I was reported in the Kalgoorlie Press as having said something similar to this. I did say that we had hoped this would be the position, but it did not develop to that extent, although the situation did improve.
- (2) As for the situation last June, the seasonal rises of unemployment in respect of June have been such that there have been rises for a number of years. Rises in previous years have been—

June, 1961—541
1960—195
1959—102
1958—573

Registered unemployed in June, 1958, totalled 6,308, or nearly 1,000 more than in June of this year.

- (3) As for the request for the appointment of an officer by the Government who could be interviewed by members of Parliament who are interested in finding work for certain people, I think this would

be a duplication of the Commonwealth department which provides this service. In addition, members can always make inquiries through the appropriate officers of the State department. Therefore I see no reason why we should make this special arrangement.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION

Council's Message

Message from the Council received and read notifying the personnel of sessional committees appointed by that House.

Appointment in Assembly

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [4.55 p.m.]: I move—

That for the present session—

- (1) the Library Committee shall consist of Mr. Speaker, Mr. Tonkin, and Mr. Crommelin;
- (2) the Standing Orders Committee shall consist of Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, Mr. J. Hegney, Mr. Cornell, and Mr. Guthrie;
- (3) the House Committee shall consist of Mr. Speaker, Mr. H. May, Mr. Jamieson, Mr. I. W. Manning, and Mr. W. A. Manning;
- (4) the Printing Committee shall consist of Mr. Speaker, Mr. Guthrie, and Mr. Rowberry.

Question put and passed.

STANDING ORDERS

Motion to Suspend

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [4.56 p.m.]: I propose to move a motion without notice—

That Standing Orders be suspended to enable notice of motion No. 2 standing in my name, and which involves a matter in which the member for Subiaco has a pecuniary interest, to be dealt with forthwith.

Speaker's Ruling

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I cannot accept this motion. We have had this argument before. If it goes on the notice paper, then it cannot be moved without notice. The honourable member is anticipating something that is on the notice paper.

Mr. TONKIN: This is not on the notice paper. What I am moving now is not on the notice paper.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): No?

Mr. TONKIN: I am moving this motion here.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): We have had this discussion before and I have ruled that the honourable member's motion is out of order.

Dissent from Speaker's Ruling

Mr. TONKIN: With due respect, Sir, I move—

That the House dissent from the Speaker's ruling.

I would have hoped that you would give some basic reason for your ruling: some Standing Order. The Speaker is not entitled to rule because he does not like something. If a Speaker rules, I submit he must rule on a Standing Order, a rule of the House, or some precedent firmly established.

I made a thorough search of the Standing Orders, and I could not find any which would preclude me from moving a motion such as this. The purport of my motion is to ask the House whether or not it is prepared to change the order of the business on the notice paper. This motion does not appear on the notice paper. That is all my motion says. As a matter of fact, I could word it this way—

I move that Standing Orders be suspended in order that the order of business on the notice paper may be changed.

Now, you would be bound to accept that motion because it is a substantive motion.

Mr. Brand: Don't you have to give notice?

Mr. TONKIN: No; I do not have to give notice if I have an absolute majority.

Mr. Brand: You haven't an absolute majority.

Mr. TONKIN: Now you are changing your tune.

Mr. Graham: How do you know he hasn't?

Mr. Brand: It is a fact; you have not a majority.

Mr. TONKIN: That is not what the Premier said first. He said that I would have to give notice. It is no good the Premier crawling out of it. He said I would have to give notice, which, of course, I do not have to do. It is competent for any member of this House to test the House on a motion without notice; and, if he can get an absolute majority for what he wants to do, he can do it.

Mr. Hawke: It is done frequently in the proceedings of the House.

Mr. TONKIN: To return to the argument you, Sir, have suggested, without mentioning any Standing Order, that I cannot do what I propose to do because some such argument as this transpired at some previous period. Now, you have placed

me at a tremendous disadvantage because you did not mention the occasion. So, because I do not know the occasion to which you referred I cannot argue that matter; and you have not mentioned any Standing Order, simply because you cannot; nor can any other member. Is the business of the House to be conducted upon this basis?

Mr. Graham: Mr. Rafferty has taken charge!

Mr. TONKIN: Every member of this House has rights and privileges, be he the Premier or the newest fledgling, and I claim that I have the right and privilege to move a substantive motion; and that is what I am doing. This motion does not appear on the notice paper; nor does anything like it, because the only decision I am asking the House to make is to change the order of business; and if the House refuses, the order of business is not changed. But you, Sir, would deny me the right to test the feeling of the House on that question. Why, the Premier himself could, immediately I resumed my seat, move that this order of business be changed! Would you rule him out of order because the motion is already on the notice paper?

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Could I have a copy of the honourable member's motion, please?

Mr. TONKIN: I think you might have given it some thought in the first place, Sir, instead of placing me in the position of having to disagree with your ruling. I submit that I am in no different position from that in which any member of the Government would be should he seek to change the order of business on the notice paper. That is all my notice of motion proposes to do at this stage. There is a notice of motion on the notice paper below the Orders of the Day. Ordinarily, notices of motion would appear all together; but because of a motion appearing earlier, Government business takes precedence over private members' business and perforce my notice of motion, being private members' business, is placed underneath Government business.

All my motion says is that the motion, on the notice paper which is private members' business, shall be lifted to a place above Government business. Now, Sir, you cannot tell me that I cannot move a motion such as that. The Premier himself could move it. He could move that notice of motion No. 2 be now taken. Would you rule that because it is on the notice paper he could not do that?

So with all due respect, Sir, I feel that you gave your present ruling without due thought to what was actually being attempted; and I would much prefer—because it is infinitely more desirable—rather than that I should put this to the

vote, and perhaps place on record a precedent which is bad, that you should indicate that, on second thoughts, you have changed your mind and that you now propose to allow me to move my motion. If you would indicate that you would give the matter further consideration, I would ask leave to withdraw my motion to disagree with your ruling; but if, on the other hand, you are adamant and feel that your ruling is correct, I have no option but to move in the direction I have indicated.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): The member for Melville has suggested that I have given this matter insufficient consideration. As a matter of fact, I considered it when I saw the notice of motion on the proof of the notice paper this morning. I think we have established a precedent in this Chamber before because I can recall the member for East Perth on one occasion taking similar action.

Mr. Graham: The then member for East Perth.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Yes, the then member for East Perth. On that occasion we had quite a lengthy debate; and the principle was clearly established that if a member wants to ventilate a matter in this Chamber he has two courses available to him: He either places the notice of motion on the notice paper, in which case it takes its place on the notice paper in the normal way and is dealt with in that order; or else he can move to suspend so much of Standing Orders as is necessary to have the matter dealt with forthwith. If he does that without notice he will then require a constitutional majority. If he cared to give notice of his intention to suspend Standing Orders, as has been done here, he would require only a simple majority.

The reason for this procedure which has been established is, I think, made quite clear in *May*; and it is that if a member gives notice then he is entitled to take his turn in the business before the House in the order in which he has placed it on the notice paper and in accordance with the wish of the Government in the order in which it is brought up. He cannot have it both ways. He cannot, as it were, take his place in the queue to get the matter before the House and, at the same time, expect to have it dealt with immediately by means of moving for the suspension of Standing Orders. He can proceed one way or the other, but he cannot have it both ways, the reason being to protect the rights of private members and to prevent their being pushed back in the order of business by the passing of a motion such as this.

Mr. HAWKE: Mr. Speaker, the explanation you have given, particularly in regard to the last point you made, might have

some logical application if there were more than one item of private members' business on the notice paper. However, there is only one item of private members' business on the notice paper, and therefore the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is not attempting to push his item of private members' business over and above items put upon the notice paper by other private members.

So the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is not doing what you say he would be attempting to do. He is not doing that at all. He is not trying to interfere with any other private members' business, because there is no other private members' business on the notice paper. Therefore your contention in that regard disappears entirely. All the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is seeking to do is to obtain consideration now, this afternoon, for a notice of motion which he lodged yesterday and which appears, of course, in print in today's notice paper. He is certainly trying to have this notice of motion considered and decided before Government business which, on today's notice paper, has a prior position to his own item; but I know of nothing in the Standing Orders which would prevent action being taken in that direction.

I was greatly impressed by the point made by the member for Melville when he said that the Premier, or any Minister acting for the Premier, could move that the order of business on the notice paper be changed; and we know, from our experience in past years, that is the rule of the road. We also know that when any such motion is moved to alter the notice paper there is never any question as to whether the motion so moved is in order; there is never any question raised on that point at all. The motion is automatically accepted and decided by the House.

I see no difference in the move made today by the member for Melville to the move that will be made many times during this session by the Premier or some other Minister that Item No. so-and-so be taken before Item No. so-and-so is considered: in other words, a motion to bring up on the notice paper an item which, when the notice paper is printed, has a lower position. We know that is a very necessary procedure to expedite the business of the House on many occasions, and it is not necessary to go into detail to explain why it would be an extremely desirable and necessary procedure.

As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, the Standing Orders give no special privileges to Ministers or to the Premier as against private members of the House, except in relation to certain Bills, especially of a financial or taxation character, which, under the terms of the Constitution, have

to be introduced by a Minister of the Crown with a Message from His Excellency the Governor.

But that situation does not exist here in connection with the move by the member for Melville, and I see no justification at all for you, Sir, ruling out of order the move by that honourable member to have his item on the notice paper raised in its present order of priority so that the House might debate and possibly decide the matter today.

The **SPEAKER** (Mr. Hearman): The question is—

Mr. Tonkin: Hasn't the Government got a viewpoint?

The **SPEAKER** (Mr. Hearman): The member for Melville has moved that my ruling be disagreed with. I will put the motion to the House.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—23.

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Curran	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. H. May
Mr. Jamieson	

(Teller.)

Noes—23.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Brand	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Burt	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Cornell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Craig	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hart	Mr. O'Neill
Dr. Henn	

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.

Noes.

Mr. Davies

Mr. Crommelin

The **SPEAKER** (Mr. Hearman): The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Noes.

Motion (to dissent from Speaker's ruling) thus negatived, and motion to suspend Standing Orders accordingly ruled out.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Postponement of Nos. 1 and 2

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.17 p.m.]: The House having decided that the motion I previously moved was out of order, I now move—

That Orders of the Day Nos. 1 and 2 be postponed.

That is a substantive motion; it does not already stand on the notice paper; nobody had any prior knowledge of it, and the situation could not be studied. It is a motion which has been moved many times

in this House, and will be moved again. If this motion is ruled out of order the Government is going to be in a nice mess—

Mr. Hawke: It is already.

Mr. **TONKIN**: —because this has nothing whatever to do with the previous motion which was ruled out of order; and you, Sir, said that the previous motion was ruled out of order because it referred to a motion already on the notice paper. That cannot be said of this motion.

Accordingly I can see no reason, Sir, which you have already submitted which could be brought forward to cause you to do otherwise than accept this motion. But I do not mind pointing out that when you accept it, as I feel you must, then your decision will be laughing at the one which has already been carried. So in accordance with my rights and privileges as a member, I move that Orders of the Day Nos. 1 and 2 be postponed.

The **SPEAKER** (Mr. Hearman): I take it the honourable member means until after notice of motion No. 2 has been dealt with?

Mr. **TONKIN**: I am not concerned with that aspect.

The **SPEAKER** (Mr. Hearman): If Orders of the Day Nos. 1 and 2 are postponed it will mean that no consideration can be given to them today.

Mr. **TONKIN**: Whilst there is no necessity for me to amend the motion I have moved, I would point out that I do not want to be awkward about this matter. I only want to achieve what I consider a reasonable proposition in the circumstances. So, to put it in order, I have no objection—so long as you, Sir, give me an assurance that you will not use these words to rule my motion out of order—to adding to my motion the words "till a later stage of the sitting". One has to be very careful in this place; it is not sufficient to rely on Standing Orders! My motion will then read—

That Orders of the Day Nos. 1 and 2 be postponed till a later stage of the sitting.

Point of Order

Mr. **BRAND**: It would seem to me this is only a backdoor method of overcoming the clear-cut terms of Standing Order No. 36, which says—

No business beyond what is of a formal character shall be entered upon before the Address in reply to the Governor's Opening Speech has been adopted.

If this motion is carried we will simply get back to the situation of dealing with business about which you, Sir, have just given a decision, and which the House has supported.

Mr. Tonkin: Can't you move the motion I have just moved?

Mr. BRAND: If it was of interest to me and in order, I might do so.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I take it the Premier is asking me to decide whether the present motion is in order?

Mr. BRAND: Yes.

Speaker's Ruling

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I think the motion is in order, because the question of deciding whether or not we suspend Standing Orders is one that will have to be dealt with after we pass this one; and it is contained in the notice of motion.

In practice, I think one could regard a motion to take one order of the day before another as a formal motion; but the one for suspension of Standing Orders is one that has already been given notice of. Accordingly I rule the present motion in order.

Debate Resumed

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [5.22 p.m.]: I oppose the motion as I believe if anything of this nature is permitted it will take business out of the Government's hands in the first place; and the Government is not desirous that the motion standing in the name of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition be debated before the Address-in-Reply.

Mr. Tonkin: Or ever!

Mr. BRAND: I oppose the motion.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.23 p.m.]: I think that some member of the Government should have expressed his view previously on the motion which was defeated, because had he done so it would have been palpable that no member on that side of the House, or on this side of the House for that matter, could reason that my motion should not have been carried.

You know, Sir, that this motion of mine which you have now ruled to be in order is precisely the same thing as that which the House previously said was out of order. It is a motion for the purpose of permitting discussion on a motion that is on the notice paper. That is what I endeavoured to establish when I was arguing against your ruling, Sir, on the previous question.

There is no doubt about the situation. The Premier, of course, had no argument at all; nor has any of his Ministers. What has happened to the perspicacity of the Minister for Industrial Development, who can usually find an argument on any subject?

Mr. Brand: You have it all.

Mr. TONKIN: That is a good thing, because the weight of argument is always on this side.

Mr. Brand: Most of the waste of time is.

Mr. TONKIN: It is not a waste of time. The Premier has said he does not want a discussion on this question until after the Address-in-Reply is adopted. So it is obvious that his purpose in opposing my motion was not because it was out of order. He took advantage of your decision Sir, to prevent discussion on this—and, in fact, to stifle it so that in the meantime his Minister could make misleading statements.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I think the honourable member is quite out of order in imputing wrong motives.

Mr. TONKIN: The Premier gave his reason himself in the few words he uttered a few moments ago. He said the Government did not desire the debate on this question to take place until after the Address-in-Reply is completed.

Mr. Hawke: Which will be at least another month.

Mr. TONKIN: In the ordinary course of events that would take another month. Without imputing any motives, I am entitled to my opinion; and I can give a very good explanation as to why the Premier could not give a reason.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Perhaps you could; but it is quite wrong.

Mr. TONKIN: I am not necessarily saying it is improper. It may be tactical, but that does not make it improper.

Mr. Brand: The Government is going to keep control of the House for as long as possible.

Mr. TONKIN: The Government forced me into the position of taking the business out of its hands; something I had no intention of doing.

Mr. Brand: Not much!

Mr. TONKIN: No, I had not; because the Premier knows that prior to this sitting the Leader of the Opposition approached him and asked him whether he was prepared to allow discussion on my motion to take place today.

Mr. Brand: That is so; and I said "No".

Mr. TONKIN: Did that indicate any intention of taking the business out of the Government's hands? Because if the Premier had agreed, there would have been no motion as subsequently moved.

Mr. Brand: Of course not!

Mr. TONKIN: But because the Premier wants to prevent discussion—for no other reason—

Mr. Brand: He does not want anything of the kind!

Mr. TONKIN: For no other reason than to prevent discussion.

Mr. Brand: He does not!

Mr. TONKIN: For that reason the Premier has forced me into the position of moving my motion, which is tantamount

to taking the business out of the Government's hands; and, of course, if it were carried the Government would be obliged to resign. I do not want to put the Government in that position at this stage. If I did, then why did the Leader of the Opposition approach the Premier in the way he did?

Mr. Brand: Because that was a fair and reasonable thing to do. It was a straight-out approach to me; and I said "No".

Mr. TONKIN: That was not taking the business out of the Government's hands. It was giving the Government an opportunity to remain in control.

Mr. Brand: And I said "No".

Mr. TONKIN: Having said "No", the reason given by the Premier—

Mr. Hawke: That is the point.

Mr. TONKIN: . . . was that he did not want discussion on the motion until after the debate on the Address-in-Reply was completed.

Mr. Brand: And for only that reason. We are not letting you take the business out of our hands.

Mr. TONKIN: This is a touchy point with the Premier.

Mr. Brand: No; it is not touchy at all.

Mr. TONKIN: The Premier should give me an opportunity to deal with the matter, and he would see whether it is touchy or not.

Mr. Bovell: As usual, you are completely off the rails.

Mr. TONKIN: What does the Minister for Lands know about it? Does he agree with the statement in the papers this evening as to what regulation 55 says?

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. TONKIN: So obviously, Sir, this motion, as you have ruled—quite correctly this time—is definitely in order. I realise that I cannot expect the House to carry this, because it is tantamount to no confidence in the Government, since it would be taking the business out of the Government's hands.

But that was not the reason the motion was moved, despite what is imputed by those on the opposite side. The circumstances prove that quite conclusively, and I give it an emphatic denial.

Mr. Brand: Of course you do! You would not hesitate if you could.

Mr. TONKIN: So I hope that at some future early date the Premier will give an opportunity for this matter to be fully discussed, and for the Government's answer to be obtained.

Mr. Grayden: What about the Address-in-Reply this afternoon? You are frightened to speak about that.

Mr. TONKIN: That shows how much the honourable member knows.

Mr. Hawke: As much as he knows about most things—nothing.

Mr. TONKIN: The Speaker will rule that because this motion is on the notice paper I cannot talk about the subject matter.

Mr. Grayden: Oh no he won't!

Mr. TONKIN: The Government's intention is to prevent discussion of this question for as long as it is possible to do so. Let the Government give me an opportunity of having this postponed for a week or a fortnight and then dealing with it; or let it give me an opportunity to withdraw the motion so that I can deal with the subject on the Address-in-Reply. But no! That would not suit. The Government does not want to hear it.

Mr. Brand: You should have thought of these things before you put it on the notice paper.

Mr. TONKIN: I could have done that; but if the Premier will think a little he will realise I cannot move a motion for a Royal Commission in the Address-in-Reply debate.

Mr. Brand: I am just saying—

Mr. TONKIN: You are saying a lot of nonsense.

Mr. Bovell: You cannot have a Royal Commission into something that has not happened.

Mr. TONKIN: I would like a Royal Commission to take place in connection with this matter.

Mr. Bovell: That is typical of you: wanting a Royal Commission on something that did not happen.

Mr. TONKIN: It is not customary for me to tell lies.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! We have had enough of this.

Mr. Brand: I can—

Mr. TONKIN: You or any of your colleagues produce one that I have told!

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! Members must address the Chair. We will not have the use of the word "liars". Last night I had to give some guidance in this matter, but unfortunately the suggestions I made have not been heeded.

Mr. TONKIN: It is extraordinary if the word "lies" cannot be uttered in this Chamber. What does one do if one brings in papers in which the word is printed?

Mr. Brand: New members must be very impressed with you. They must think you are just the thing.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! The member for Melville has implied that my suggestion that the words "lies" and "liars" should not occur in parliamentary debates is wrong. I wish to make it very clear to this House that it has been long

established in British parliamentary tradition that epithets of that nature and statements such as "The man is a liar," or "The man has told lies," or "The man is telling deliberate falsehoods" have been ruled as being unparliamentary in many Houses. The difficulty that arises here is that last night I did show some tolerance and leniency in the hope that it would not be abused. However, I am very disappointed to find today that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to whom last night I showed some tolerance promptly takes advantage of the situation and proceeds to do exactly the same thing again, notwithstanding the fact that he knows perfectly well it is not warranted.

Mr. TONKIN: I have no intention of offending in the direction which you say, Sir. But I am going to point this out for the records: That provided I do not directly call any member a liar or say that any member is telling lies, there is nothing to preclude me from saying that some statement I have seen somewhere is a pack of lies. But if your ruling were taken literally I would be prevented from saying that; and what a situation that would be!

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It would depend on how it was said, of course.

Mr. TONKIN: If people tell lies, they ought to be told about it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It would depend on how it was said.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! I do not think the honourable member is discussing the motion at all now.

Mr. TONKIN: I agree; but neither were you.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! I am not going to take a direct direction from a member on the floor of the House. I accordingly draw attention to the fact, as I am entitled to do, that I do not like the word "liar" being used; and it is not the function of the Speaker to debate motions of this House.

Mr. TONKIN: Surely you do not expect me—

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I expect the honourable member to get on with the motion; and I do not want any further discussion on parliamentary language.

Mr. TONKIN: On a personal explanation, I would say: Surely you do not expect me to sit here while you, in mild terms, castigate me without giving me the opportunity of explaining the situation; or do you?

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): The honourable member should know perfectly well what the position is, and I do not think any explanation is called for.

Mr. Bovell: You are defying the Chair.

Mr. TONKIN: What does the Minister know about it?

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. TONKIN: He is the Minister who said he did not send out a circular from his office telling migrants coming in—

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! That has nothing to do with the motion.

Mr. TONKIN: Of course; but what does he know about it?

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! The honourable member will address himself to the motion.

Mr. TONKIN: Very well, Sir. The motion is now one which involves taking the business of the House out of the hands of the Government. But it was not moved for that purpose, and its real intention cannot now be achieved. But that is not my fault. I moved this motion in order to highlight the decision which was given on the previous motion; and I hope that in future, Sir, this illustration will be kept in mind when a similar situation arises. I move the motion accordingly.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—23.

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Curran	Mr. Molr
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. H. May
Mr. Jamieson	

(Teller.)

Noes—23.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Brand	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Burt	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Cornell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Craig	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hart	Mr. O'Neill
Dr. Henn	

(Teller.)

Pair.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Davies	Mr. Crommelin

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Noes.

Question thus negatived.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SECOND DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 26th July, on the following motion by Mr. Runciman:—

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor in reply to the Speech he has been pleased to deliver to Parliament:—

May it please your Excellency:

We, the members of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Western Australia in Parliament

assembled, beg to express loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [5.41 p.m.]: I have already congratulated you, Sir, upon your re-election to the office of Speaker in this Legislative Assembly, and all I need to say further in that regard is to confirm the congratulations and good wishes which it was my pleasure to issue to you a few days ago.

I would like also to congratulate the new Chairman of Committees, the member for Wellington. He has not the easiest task in the world to perform as Chairman of Committees; because now and then when we are in Committee quite ticklish questions of procedure do arise, and it sometimes becomes very difficult to know clearly which is the proper course to follow in accordance with the Standing Orders and the rules and procedures of the Parliament.

However, I am sure the member for Wellington has already taken considerable confidence from the fact that he will, when acting as Chairman, have on either side of him experts in Standing Orders and procedures; and probably he has also taken some confidence in the fact that all of the members here, or practically all of the members, are reasonable and full of understanding; and every one of us, too, still has left a little of the milk of human kindness. So I wish him well in his occupancy of that position.

I have a long list of congratulations to offer. First of all, I have in mind the member for Mt. Marshall. I am very sorry indeed he did not remain in the Ministry long enough for me to be able to include him in congratulations today. Perhaps I should substitute for "congratulations on his appointment as a Minister" the words, "congratulations on his good judgment and good luck in getting out of the Ministry when he did"—

Mr. J. Hegney: The Ministry is weakened by his absence.

Mr. HAWKE: —because I have a strong feeling that had the member for Mt. Marshall not retired voluntarily from the Ministry when he did, he would certainly have retired as a protest against what the Liberal Party Ministers of the Government did in connection with the election for the Darling Range seat, and certainly in connection with what they did subsequently over the by-election for that area. I propose to have something further to say about that at a later stage.

I would like to offer congratulations to the new Minister for Education, and also to the new Minister for Police—both Country Party representatives. They have,

indeed, been really very fortunate, as I am sure they will both freely and quickly agree. Prior to their appointment to the Ministry they had periods of parliamentary experience which were remarkably short. Therefore, one must congratulate them very sincerely upon the great opportunity which has come to them so soon in their parliamentary careers.

I think each one of them holds a Legislative Assembly seat which it is not difficult to continue to hold as a Country Party representative, even though the Liberal Party is sworn to try to wipe Country Party parliamentary representation out entirely in this Parliament—unless the Country Party in the meantime agrees to be swallowed up by the Liberal Party under the high-fluting name of a merger.

I am very much satisfied that Country Party Ministers like the Minister for Education and the Minister for Police are fully awake to what this term "merger" would really mean if the Country Party of Western Australia were foolish enough to be caught up with it and in it. It would, naturally, mean the end of the Country Party as a political force; and would mean, of course, that the influence which they now exercise in the affairs of Parliament and the Government would come to an end.

I read, during the Darling Range by-election campaign, where the Deputy Premier—who is, of course, Leader of the Parliamentary Country Party in this State—said the question of any merger was as dead as the Dodo. If that is so—and I feel certain it is, because of the strong opposition of the rank and file of the Country Party people outside Parliament—then the declaration of the Liberal Party, made on several occasions in recent years, to strive continuously to wipe out any non-Labor Party in the State except its own, is a declaration which that party will strive increasingly to achieve and to put into practice.

We know, from our observations and from practical experience, that the Liberal Party in politics in Australia today is a very desperate organisation—desperate to wipe out any opposition, desperate to wipe out any interference; and desperate to become the Government in its own absolute right in order that there should be no delay at all in putting into practice the policies for which the Liberal Party actually stands. And those policies are, of course, not the printed policies the Liberal Party develops for the benefit of the unwary, for the benefit of the general electors. The real hidden policies of the Liberal Party are, of course, very dangerous policies—

Mr. Brand: You must be speaking from experience of your own party.

Mr. HAWKE: —so far as the farmers are concerned and so far as industrial workers are concerned.

Mr. Brand: You should not judge other parties by your own.

Mr. HAWKE: For instance, I read in the newspaper today where the Liberal Party Conference had carried certain motions in Perth this week. At least two of them were absolute votes of no-confidence in their own Ministers in this Government. I do not know whether the Premier has heard about these motions—

Mr. Brand: I will in due course—officially.

Mr. HAWKE: —or whether they will be sent to him for action. I can imagine the sort of private conversation he will have with the secretary of the Liberal Party about them!

Mr. Brand: You should know. I think you have had to speak to your own general secretary.

Mr. HAWKE: I feel sure the Premier will tell the General Secretary of the Liberal Party, quietly and confidentially, to put them "up his jumper."

Mr. Court: Is that what you tell Joe?

Mr. HAWKE: I now come to the new private members, of whom we have quite a few on this occasion. I think I will start with the best of them—from a political viewpoint—and offer my congratulations to the member for Canning upon his very fine achievement in winning a semi-rural seat against the combined opposition of the Liberal Party and the Country Party at the recent general election. That was a very fine achievement indeed; and it was clear—when the second preference votes of the Country Party candidate for Canning were allocated—that—and the allocation represented considerable proof—rural electors in that electorate preferred a Labor Party representative in Parliament to a Liberal Party representative—

Mr. Bickerton: That was understandable!

Mr. HAWKE: —because the present member for Canning received quite a reasonable percentage—much more than the ordinary average percentage—of No. 2 votes from the Country Party candidate. So, from that, it is very clear that rural electors within reasonable touch of the metropolitan area are more and more realising that their second choice—their first choice being the Country Party—is the Labor Party, and that, of course, is a great step forward in the awakening of political consciousness among those people.

I am sure it is an awakening which will increase greatly in future years, and become so intensified within a reasonable period of time as to ensure that where a Liberal Party candidate, a Country Party candidate, and a Labor Party candidate stand for the one electorate, the Country

Party No. 2 preferences, where the Country Party candidate is eliminated, will go in increasing numbers to the Labor candidate. That is commonsense, actually.

It is obvious, I think, that Country Party supporters are becoming much more politically wide awake in respect of the question as to where their real interests lie and as to how their interests will be best protected in the Parliament.

I offer my sincere congratulations next to the new Country Party members, because they get my second preference.

Mr. Brand: Don't embarrass them!

Mr. HAWKE: We find that those new Country Party candidates—the member for Avon, the member for Roe, and the member for Stirling—if I have all the names of the electorates correct—succeeded against very vigorous Liberal Party opposition.

It was clear that the Liberal Party was really out to reduce Country Party strength in this Parliament very considerably; otherwise it would not have given a second thought to contesting the seat of Stirling or the seat of Roe. It might have been excused for giving a second thought—and even a third thought—to the question of contesting the seat of Avon, because the member who retired there a few months ago was a Liberal Party member, and an endorsed member of the Liberal Party. So the Liberal Party did have every justification in thinking the people of that electorate might again be misled sufficiently to maintain Liberal Party representation for that district.

However, as I remember the figures, the new member for Avon won with great ease; and it became clear—as it was to many of us before the election took place—that the great majority of people in that electorate were Country Party in outlook, and would—nine times out of ten—in the great majority support a Country Party candidate.

I do not think it necessary to go into the story as to why the Avon electorate was represented for a period by an endorsed Liberal Party candidate, except to say that candidate first won the seat as a Country Party representative; held it for several years as a Country Party representative; and, I think, was responsible for founding the so-called new Liberal Party.

He was able to carry a great personal vote when he left the Country Party and joined the Liberal Party; and it was no surprise—certainly no surprise to me, because his electorate joined mine—when he was able to hold the seat as a Liberal Party candidate. I would go so far as to say that Jim Mann could have held the seat as a Labor Party candidate. There is no shadow of doubt about that. He was held in very high esteem by the great majority of people in that area.

I offer my congratulations to the two new members of the Liberal Party—I think I have the numbers right. I see a member in a strange-looking seat up there; but I do not think he is new. I refer to the Minister for Lands, in case he is in some doubt.

I listened attentively to the member for Murray when he moved the adoption of the Address-in-Reply here the other day. As I told him soon afterwards, I think he acquitted himself very well indeed. I had the same experience myself a great many years ago, and I know the experience of moving the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, as a new member, is an ordeal; and my experience was that the more my friends and colleagues tried to buoy me up before the event, the less confident I became that I would swim the channel from side to side. However, the member for Murray did extremely well, and I again congratulate him upon his efforts.

I was very pleased to hear him speak the way he did about Sir Ross McLarty, and the wonderful representation which Sir Ross gave to that district over a great many years; and I am sure we would all join in trusting that Sir Ross's health has continuously improved and that he will soon be able to get about reasonably well again.

I called to see Sir Ross during the Murray by-election campaign. I have never seen him looking better in the face. He was healthy-looking, and he was cheerful. He looked almost as if he was "swinging the lead", being in bed as he was. Naturally, however, he was under doctor's orders; and I think the doctor's orders were that he should remain in bed for three months after the time he left hospital and had another slight heart attack. On my basis of quick reckoning, I think the period of three months might now be just about up.

I certainly hope, as I am sure all members would, that Sir Ross might now be on the move again, and will have several years yet to live as a citizen in his beloved home-town of Pinjarra, and to meet and mingle and converse with his friends and relatives down in that part of the State. I would be very pleased if the present member for Murray would take that message to Sir Ross and Lady McLarty as an expression from the House.

Mr. Runciman: I will be pleased to do that.

Mr. HAWKE: The member for Darling Range is in a somewhat different category, although that does not in any degree lessen the measure of congratulations which I would offer to him upon the success which he achieved. As a matter of fact, he might deserve double congratulations because he had to face up to two elections within a period of some three months.

I imagine the first election in March was quite a hectic one, although I did not participate in it. I am certain of my own personal knowledge and experience up there during the by-election campaign that the second contest was really hot—it was burning hot. One did not have to move far around the electorate, and to meet and talk with many people to realise the heat was being really turned on by the Liberal Party against the Country Party, and even more so by the Country Party against the Liberal Party.

Mr. Cornell: Perhaps that is why they turned the water on.

Mr. HAWKE: And there was every justification indeed for the heat which the Country Party turned on against the Liberal Party.

I now wish to discuss that subject at some reasonable length. As I understand the situation—and there is a fair amount of justification for this belief—at least the Liberal Party Ministers and the Country Party Ministers had an understanding prior to the general election last March that no sitting member of either party would be opposed by the other party. I wish the Deputy Premier would put his head up and listen to what I have to say in regard to this. In fact, the Deputy Premier—who, as I said earlier, is the parliamentary leader of the Country Party in Western Australia—is reported as having said at Darlington in a speech made during the by-election campaign, that it was understood by the Country Party prior to the March general election that no sitting member of either party would be opposed by the other party at that election.

Mr. Nalder: That is not quite correct.

Mr. HAWKE: Would the Deputy Premier tell us what is quite correct? How long am I allowed to wait without speaking for a reply, Mr. Speaker?

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Interjections, of course, are most disorderly.

Mr. HAWKE: Mr. Speaker, I have known you well enough over the years, both as a private member and as Speaker, to be sure you would not deny the Deputy Premier one interjection.

Mr. J. Hegney: And the Speaker likes interjections, too, if I remember rightly.

Mr. Nalder: I said it was not quite correct, and that is as far as I am going.

Mr. HAWKE: I am asking the Deputy Premier what is quite correct in the matter.

Mr. Nalder: I will leave it at that for the moment.

Mr. HAWKE: It is no wonder that Ray Owen was defeated by the Liberals—no wonder at all! I have never known such a weak attitude to be adopted in a situation like this. It is no wonder at all that just as Ray Owen was sent down the

drain on this occasion by the Liberal Party because the leaders of the Country Party were not prepared to stand up to the Liberal Party, so other members of the Country Party in this House could in the same way go down the drain in future years. It is unthinkable that two parties to a coalition Government would not have some understanding, if not an arrangement or an agreement, under the terms of which the sitting members of each party would be given a fair go.

Mr. Grayden: There should have been, but there was not.

Mr. HAWKE: How would the member for South Perth know?

Mr. Grayden: There was not.

Mr. HAWKE: I would rather hear from the member for Mt. Marshall who, unfortunately, has to sit next to the member for South Perth in this House.

Mr. Grayden: You want the information; we have given it to you.

Mr. HAWKE: If that is so, there must have been some understanding.

Mr. Cornell: There was; but there was an escape clause in it.

Mr. HAWKE: Yes; I imagine that the arrangement, or the understanding, or the agreement, or whatever it was between the Country Party Ministers and the Liberal Party Ministers upon this vital issue did have an escape clause.

Mr. Grayden: It hinged on whether a Labor candidate stood or not.

Mr. Jamieson: A Labor Party candidate was endorsed long before nominations closed.

Mr. HAWKE: I am sure there was no real escape clause, either a verbal one or a written one.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You are not personally upset about this, are you?

Mr. HAWKE: Yes; I am. I am personally very upset about it, as even the Minister for Health will come to understand before I have finished saying what I have to say on the subject.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I am wondering whether you are personally upset or whether it is the party you are upset about.

Mr. HAWKE: I am very much upset personally; because I believe Ray Owen was sacrificed—destroyed—by one section of the coalition Government. What justification did the Liberal Party have for opposing him? Was he not a loyal supporter of the coalition Government in this House during the years the coalition Government was in office? Was he not reliable? Was he not dependable? Was he not a decent citizen?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I think he has only come to mean so much to you now that he is out of the House.

Mr. HAWKE: If the Minister for Health cares to talk to Ray Owen personally the Minister will find he is absolutely wrong in what he has just said.

Mr. Heal: As usual.

Mr. HAWKE: This escape clause, as I said a few moments ago, before the two or three interjections came along—and I do not mind them, by the way—was not expressed verbally and was not stated in writing. It was an escape clause conjured up by the shrewd heads of the Liberal Party at the appropriate time.

Mr. Graham: Ten minutes before nominations closed.

Mr. HAWKE: How long before nominations closed for the Darling Range election did the Deputy Premier know that the Liberal Party intended to put an endorsed candidate into the field? I am sure you, Mr. Speaker, would allow the Deputy Premier one more interjection. How long before did he know? He did not know at all, I suppose. How long before nominations for Darling Range closed last March did the present Minister for Education know the Liberal Party was putting an endorsed candidate into the field?

Mr. Lewis: I was too busy worrying about my own.

Mr. HAWKE: Of course! The Minister has the safest seat in Western Australia.

Mr. Heal: The Minister had no worries.

Mr. HAWKE: I know how much worry the Minister for Education was experiencing. How long before the event did the present member for Narrogin know? He did not know at all. How long before it did the member for Mt. Marshall know of the intention of the Liberal Party in this matter? He did not know at all.

Mr. Graham: How long before it did Ray Owen know?

Mr. HAWKE: It was just a low-down, scurvy, political trick organised by the Liberal Party headquarters probably prompted by the Minister for Industrial Development.

Mr. Court: I was wondering when you were going to come around to me.

Mr. Graham: It would be typical.

Mr. HAWKE: Of course it is part of the policy of the Liberal Party in this State to wipe out the Country Party as a political force.

Point of Order

Mr. GRAYDEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order may I say that as a Liberal I regard the statements which the Leader of the Opposition has made as being offensive because they are quite untrue. An agreement was drawn up in respect of Darling Range, which hinged upon a

candidate being endorsed by the Labor Party, and it was not until one or two days before—

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I cannot allow any debate on a point of order. The objection has been noted.

Debate Resumed

Mr. HAWKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for noting the objection. I think you were very generous even going to that extent. I can quote from speeches made by the Premier at Mt. Barker and Albany in which he dealt very specifically and in unusually clear-cut terms with this issue. He did not beat about the bush; he did not leave anybody in any doubt as to what the attitude of the Liberal Party as such is. When I speak of the Liberal Party in this sense I speak of the total complete organisation in Western Australia, and not of the parliamentary section; for the most part they only do what they are told.

Mr. Graham: And they make a poor job of that, too.

Mr. HAWKE: The Premier stated at a public meeting at Mt. Barker that the Liberal Party wanted a merger with the Country Party; and should the Country Party refuse to accept the offer of a merger with the Liberal Party, then the Liberal Party would have to go ahead and oppose Country Party candidates and contest districts held by the Country Party until such time as the Liberal Party would be in a position in Parliament to govern in its own absolute right without having to rely on the Country Party in any shape or form.

I do not quarrel with this declaration by the Liberal Party. It is entitled to have this objective and to make this determination; but it seems to me that when the two parties are in a coalition Government there are certain principles which should be upheld and promoted.

Mr. Court: You seem very concerned about the freedom of action that the non-socialistic parties have as compared with yours.

Mr. HAWKE: Yes; I am very concerned about the freedom which the so-called non-socialistic Liberal Party has—very concerned.

Mr. Court: We have much more flexibility in our actions than your team has.

Mr. HAWKE: I know in my own mind for certain that should the more extreme right-wing members of the Liberal Party ever have the opportunity they will clamp a dictatorship upon Western Australia and upon Australia. There might have been some justification—some slight justification—in respect of this alleged or real escape clause for the Liberal Party opposing the sitting Country Party member for

Darling Range at the general election; but surely there was none at the by-election.

Mr. Court: That seems to be a bit of peculiar reasoning.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Yes.

Mr. HAWKE: The logic of the reasoning is this—and I am sure the Minister for Industrial Development will understand it, even if the Minister for Health has a bit of a struggle with it—

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I will leave the Chair until 7.30 p.m.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. HAWKE: When we suspended for tea I was about to discuss the point that the Liberal Party, if it had any justification whatsoever for opposing the sitting Country Party member for Darling Range at the general election, had no justification of any kind at the by-election. The only excuse I have heard offered for the Liberal Party contesting the general election in the Darling Range electorate was that a Labor candidate had nominated, and therefore the Labor candidate might win the seat; so the Liberal Party would come in and help to save the seat.

I think all past records in the Darling Range electorate, as lined up with the new boundaries, would have shown the Labor Party had no possible chance of winning the election. In any event the general election result proved that beyond any shadow of doubt, because the Labor candidate secured only slightly more than one-third of the total primary votes.

Clearly, then, there was no possibility at all of the Labor candidate winning the seat at the by-election, because the combined total of the Liberal Party and the Country Party votes was such as to make it abundantly clear the Labor candidate would finish far short of a majority in the event of only the Country Party and the Labor Party contesting the by-election. It is true also to say that of those who voted No. 1 for the Liberal Party candidate at the general election over 90 per cent. would have voted No. 1 for the Country Party candidate at the by-election, had no Liberal Party candidate been in the field at that stage.

Obviously the Darling Range electorate would have been a very easy contest for the Country Party to win at the by-election, had the Liberal Party not been in the contest. So whatever excuse the Liberal Party had for contesting the seat at the general election—I think it had practically none in all the circumstances—it certainly had none at the by-election.

I want to say something about the use which was made by the Liberal Party, through the Minister for Works and Water Supplies, at the by-election, of the

question of water extensions being made available to the Forrestfield and Wattle Grove areas; but I propose to discuss that matter after I have discussed one other subject.

The new member for the South-east Province, The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs, received a letter recently from a Mr. McDonald of Cocklebidy on the Eyre Highway. Mr. Stubbs passed that letter on to me for my perusal and for any suggestions which I might care to make in connection with it. I think this letter is worth reading to the House even though it is fairly lengthy. I propose now to do so. It is as follows:—

24th June, 1962.

Dear Mr. Stubbs,

After a lot of consideration, I am enclosing some papers which I would like you to read through, and return at a later date. Being our local member, I want you, if you think fit, to place the facts before the Opposition Leader, Mr. Hawke. The first talk of the motels being allotted along the Eyre Highway was October, 1961, and I have enclosed the letter notifying me that my application was accepted in May, 1962. As you can see by the enclosed letters, the Lands Board stated that they realised to make motels paying propositions they must not be placed too close together. As you know yourself, I have been held up for nearly twelve months with the outside septic toilets, as I started them last July, and had then to wait to see if granted the motel site, where it would be exactly allotted. There were two lots of tenders called for the motel sites, to which we applied each time, over a period of months. Whereas the B.P. site was granted in a matter of minutes. After reading the paper where the Premier, Mr. Brand, had granted a special motel site for B.P. I looked up the Government Gazette and saw where tenders were being called for a new site on the Highway. The Gazette was printed on the 18th May, 1962 which was a Friday. As all Government offices are closed over the weekend it wouldn't be posted until Monday, 21st of May, and the tenders closed on the Wednesday, 23rd May, which would be leaving a margin of two days for the Gazette to arrive at Norseman for anyone's inspection. I feel it would be well nigh an impossibility for it to arrive in Norseman, and anyone to be able to submit a tender in that short a period. Bearing in mind that I have the written statement from the Lands Board that they didn't intend placing opposition close to the given sites, and the same as Mr. Jackson at Balladonia, we were verbally assured that providing we

built our new motels to regulations that nothing would be let go between the now existing motel sites. The B.P. had tendered for Cocklebidy at the Lands Board meeting and it was granted to me. The mere fact of us having to wait months for the tenders to be finalised and B.P. missing out fair and squarely at the Lands Board meeting, and then in a few minutes being handed a site only 42 miles from Cocklebidy on a silver platter, so to speak, makes me feel that there has been foul and underhand corruption done somewhere along the line.

I do not agree with that. I continue reading the letter—

I have no definite proof but if seen into you could find out that the surveyors were sent out to peg the three sites before the site to B.P. was allotted. I think you know, Mr. Stubbs, how we have started out here from scratch. I built this up, such as it is, from nothing. Six years ago I was serving tea and pies to the travellers in a tent, before we had bowsters installed. Dry times the only drinking water polluted with the carcasses of field mice, and foxes. Your young family—

Of course, he means his own family—

—missing out on pleasures that a town affords. Surely this counts for something when its justice you want to see. I have gone into debt for at least £10,000, which is an awful lot of money to me on the assumption that there would be nothing on the road between Balladonia and myself. I am a peace-abiding man and don't like arguments but feel it is my duty to children and myself to face up to the matter as I feel sure of underhand work somewhere. Instead of taking the alternative and easy way of ignoring the facts which are very plain to see.

Trusting you can do something for me in this matter. I realise the other motel will go up, as the site has been granted, but if an underhand thing could be proved and exposed it would be only right for the future of our children who have to carry on. Thanking you,

I am,

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) W. McDonald.

Mr. Graham: No wonder the Premier chooses not to listen!

Mr. HAWKE: It is obvious from the letter that Mr. McDonald feels a very great injustice has been inflicted upon him. I think he also knows his investment is to be destroyed; because it will, I have no

doubt, be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for him successfully to operate his motel business with such strong competition so close at hand.

When I read his letter and noted the dates in respect of the calling of applications in the appropriate *Government Gazette*, and the closing date for the applications, I simply could not believe what his letter stated to be, in fact, true. I could not imagine any Government or any Government Department would call applications for the leasing of a site way out in the middle of nowhere and publish the fact that applications were being so called in a *Government Gazette* dated on a Friday, with applications closing on the following Wednesday in Perth.

However, as honourable members know, I called for the tabling of the files, and checked on the dates which were set down in the letter from Mr. McDonald to Mr. Stubbs. To my very great astonishment I found the dates which were set out in this letter were absolutely correct. And, of course, the only application was from B.P. Australia Ltd.

I have very great admiration for this company, and I know it has done a great thing for Western Australia by the establishment near Fremantle of the oil refinery; and in normal circumstances I would be one of the first to assist it, within reason. But I certainly think it is well outside the bounds of reason to call applications in this restricted way when of those who might be interested in making application for the lease of the land in question the only ones to know that applications were to be called and were to close so quickly were the representatives of this company.

That is not fair dealing or a reasonable procedure. That is treating one citizen or one company in the community with very great favour and preference as compared with other citizens and other companies. It might well be that other people would have been interested in applying for the lease of this piece of land in order that they might establish a motel on it; although on that point I would say there is no justification at all for the Government making land available for the erection and operation of a motel so close to existing motels, especially when we remember that the sites of the leases granted to Mr. McDonald and someone else nearer Balladonia were granted only a few weeks before.

Obviously when Mr. McDonald was granted his lease by the Land Board and the other persons concerned were granted their lease some 100 miles along the track, they came to the conclusion that they were the only leases that were likely to be granted for some years to come.

Mr. Bickerton: They tendered on that condition.

Mr. HAWKE: Naturally they went ahead and put their money into it and their money is just as valuable to them—in fact far more valuable—than a similar amount of money would be to B.P. Yet they have hardly invested the whole of their money in their concerns before they suddenly find their investment is in the process of being butchered, because that is almost certain to happen in at least one of these instances.

I think I said earlier the B.P. motel, when constructed, will only be some 41 or 43 miles from the motel which Mr. McDonald is to operate. Members will have no difficulty in realising that 41 or 43 miles is neither here nor there, and I have no doubt that in competition within such a short distance the B.P. undertaking will be able, without much trouble or difficulty, easily to out-compete the smaller man.

Mr. Graham: It could withstand losses for a little while, whereas the smaller man could not.

Mr. HAWKE: What concerns me more is that this McDonald man pioneers from nothing a service to motor travellers on the Eyre Highway. He pioneered it the hard way and battled. He and his family underwent all the hardships imaginable—hardships which, I admit, I would not think of undertaking. But, despite this, all the reward he gets from the State Government is the introduction of powerful competition which it will, I am afraid, be impossible for him to withstand.

Mr. Bickerton: Perhaps he is not a member of the Liberal Party.

Mr. HAWKE: I did not want to bring party politics into it. I did not want to bring anything into this subject except the fact that this person—this battler and pioneer on the Eyre Highway—has been misled by the Government into making his investment; and subsequently, when he is committed to the investment up to the ears, he finds without warning—because he did not see this *Gazette* before the day on which applications closed in Perth—that his investment is in very great danger of being totally destroyed.

I say it is a very poor show indeed. So far as I can see, nothing can be done now to undo the wrong which has been done, because the lease for the B.P. motel has been signed, sealed, and delivered, and the company is in possession of the complete legal rights in the matter and doubtless will go ahead without any thought or consideration for what is likely to happen to the little man 40 miles down the road.

I know competition in the petrol world on the wholesale selling side is very fierce. I know the bigger petrol companies are fairly ruthless in trying to outdo the others in the sale of petrol and oils; but I would have hoped that in a situation of this kind the anxiety—the desperate

anxiety, if you like—of this company to sell more petrol at this particular point on the Eyre Highway might, in all the circumstances, have been forgone by the company at least until this smaller man had had a reasonable chance to build up and get into the position where he might with some degree of success stand up to such formidable competition.

Mr. Graham: It is not the company's fault. It is the Government's.

Mr. HAWKE: My friend, the member for Balcatta, says it is not the company's fault but the Government's fault. In the situation as it now exists it certainly is the Government's fault; but had the company not had such a desperate anxiety to sell a few more gallons of petrol at that particular site on the highway, the company would not have worried the Government to provide a site, and consequently B.P. Aust. Ltd. would not now be in possession of the necessary approval and the necessary lease to enable it to go ahead with its undertaking.

Mr. Graham: This Government cannot say "No" to big business.

Mr. Brand: Is that so?

Mr. HAWKE: I come back now to the Forrestfield-Wattle Grove water supply proposition. The member for South Perth the other night told us that a perusal of the appropriate files completely justified the Minister in what he had done and also was a complete and shattering answer to any criticism which might be levelled against the Minister for the action he took. The only part of the file which the member for South Perth quoted in support of his extravagant claim did not go anywhere near proving his assertion. It disproved it.

Mr. Grayden: Nonsense!

Mr. HAWKE: The part of the file he quoted disproved the assertion he made and the claim he made, and it is fairly obvious why he did not quote more than once from the file; because closer examination of it, and more particularly a proper understanding of it—which would not be easy in the instance of the member for South Perth—shows beyond any shadow of doubt that the Minister used his position as a Liberal Party Minister in the coalition Government to do something to put the skids under the Country Party candidate for the Darling Range electorate by-election. There can be no shadow of doubt about that.

Country Party members who studied these files could not reach any other conclusion than the one to which I have just referred. I start way back on the 28th December, 1961, because at that stage—and probably even earlier—a Country Party member for the Central Province (Mr. Norman Baxter, M.L.C.) wrote to the Minister in connection with this suggested extension of the water supply system to the

Wattle Grove areas, and he made a request that the Minister should place on the Loan Estimates for the 1962-63 financial year some money to enable the proposal to be commenced.

It might very well be that Mr. Baxter had an eye at that time upon the Darling Range electorate. He might have been concerned as to what would happen there. I have an idea he does not trust the Liberal Party very much, and so it might well have been that he was working for the purpose of trying to ensure that any action which was taken or promised prior to the March general election would be taken as a result of the initiative of himself and, no doubt, his Country Party colleague at that time, Mr. Ray Owen, M.L.A.

On the 4th January this year, the Minister wrote to Mr. Baxter at Parliament House; and, in the appropriate part of the letter, stated—

However, it is most unlikely that the proposal could be included in the estimates earlier than 1963-64.

And for the benefit of the member for South Perth, that is not next financial year. On the 3rd July, 1962—which was, of course, after the general election and not many days before the by-election—the Under-Secretary for the Metropolitan Water Supply Department wrote to Mr. Baxter following a discussion which Mr. Baxter had had with the Chief Engineer and the under-secretary concerning the question of reticulating water to the Forrestfield area. In the appropriate portion of the letter he said—

I would reaffirm the previous advice that a review of revenue potential will be carried out within the next few months and with the assistance of information supplied per medium of Mr. Ray Owen's survey some months back the economics of the proposition will be put to the honourable Minister well before the draft Loan Estimates of 1963-1964 are prepared in February next.

Mr. Grayden: In February next?

Mr. HAWKE: Yes, February, 1963.

Mr. Grayden: Well before next February.

Mr. HAWKE: This letter, as I pointed out earlier, was written on the 3rd July; so, of course, there was no possibility of the department working out the economics of the proposition before the by-election for Darling Range which was then due to take place, only a few days afterwards. Then Mr. Don May, the member for Cannington, on the 3rd July wrote to the Under-Secretary for the Metropolitan Water Supply Department. In his letter he asked for consideration to be given to the question of connecting scheme water to the properties of three or four electors down Grove Road in Wattle Grove.

On the 10th July—getting much closer still, of course, to the by-election date for Darling Range—the under-secretary advised Mr. May in this manner, and I quote the appropriate section of the letter—

Until it is practicable to strengthen the supply by the construction of a large and costly feeder main along William Street, extensions from the existing reticulation cannot be considered.

Then on the 11th July *The Daily News* came out with a special by-election article. This is a photostat copy taken of that article. I did not take it.

Mr. W. Hegney: Bill Grayden took it, didn't he?

Mr. HAWKE: It is on the Metropolitan Water Supply Department file No. 640998/61. It has the photos of Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Owen, Mr. Dunne, and Mr. Wild; and the heading is, "5,490 have never had it so good." I do not know whether the newspaper or the photographer doctored this photograph of the Minister—

Mr. Wild: Give me the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. HAWKE: —or whether they thought that in the circumstances of the situation it would be appropriate to make him appear as the Al Capone of Western Australian politics. I invite all members of the House to have a look at this photograph of the Minister.

Mr. Bickerton: It looks as though you have the back page.

Mr. I. W. Manning: I cannot recognise him from here.

Mr. HAWKE: He appears to have only two teeth—unluckily for him, both at the top.

Mr. Wild: They are wrong. I have more than that.

Mr. HAWKE: He certainly looks as if he is in the process of working some scurvy political trick; and so, of course, he did.

Mr. Bickerton: The camera does not lie.

Mr. HAWKE: I congratulate the photographer or those who doctored the photograph before it was reproduced in *The Daily News*.

On the 10th July, which was, as I understand it, the date on which the Minister made his now infamous political promise at Forrestfield—

Mr. Wild: It was Tuesday, the 12th July.

Mr. HAWKE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister says it was the 12th July.

Mr. Wild: It was a Tuesday.

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister said it was a Tuesday; and when I consulted my diary—which I think is produced by B.P. Australia Ltd.—I found the Tuesday in

question was the 10th July. Therefore it was the 10th July and not the 12th July as the Minister thought.

On the 10th July the Under-Secretary of the Metropolitan Water Supply Department gave Mr. May to understand that nothing could be done at all in this matter for the reasons I have expressed previously. He did tell Mr. May that the economics were being investigated, and so on, and that before February next they would be completed and the water estimates would be prepared some time before February next. In the event of the proposal being approved, then finance would be included in the Loan Estimates for the financial year 1963-64.

Yet the Minister went along to that meeting at Forrestfield—this Liberal Party meeting on the 10th July—and made a public announcement that Forrestfield and Wattle Grove would be serviced with water, and that the work would commence in the reasonably near future and be completed within a period of two years.

Mr. Wild: Have another look at the file and you will see that before Forrestfield is serviced the water has to be taken to the back door of the district; and the only thing on the Estimates for this year is the main taking the water to the back-door of Forrestfield—so allowing it to be, as was said in every statement, commenced in 1963-64.

Mr. HAWKE: I am talking about the fact that when Country Party members of Parliament approached the department—the departmental head—and approached the Minister they were fobbed off every time with the excuse that nothing could be done.

Mr. Wild: They were all told the same—1963-1964.

Mr. HAWKE: Yet the Minister went out to Forrestfield and made the announcement that the proposition is set, sealed, and okayed. Why did the Minister do that? Why did he go to that meeting organised by the Liberal Party and make that statement? There is only one reason. Obviously, the reason he went to Forrestfield and made that declaration was to try to influence votes away from the Country Party, because the Country Party is solidly represented throughout Forrestfield and Wattle Grove because of the considerable number of small farmers—and perhaps some larger ones, too—who operate in that territory.

From the party-political point of view, I congratulate the Minister upon his strategy, because it was successful. The result of the Darling Range by-election as between the Liberal Party candidate and the Country Party candidate was decided in that area because the No. 1 votes for the Country Party candidate in that area in the by-election, as compared with the

general election, were down; and the No. 1 votes for the Liberal Party candidate were up.

I think we can all remember that at the general election the Liberal Party candidate defeated the Country Party candidate by only one vote in the primary count, which meant that the Country Party candidate was eliminated. His second preferences were distributed, and the Liberal Party candidate was declared elected. We also know that subsequent to that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, sitting as a Court of Disputed Returns, examined the whole situation in regard to the votes to which objections were made, and he declared the result to be a tie on the primary count as between the Liberal and the Country Party candidates; declared the general election null and void; and ordered a new election altogether. That, of course, was the by-election.

Obviously, when the result of the general election in Darling Range was a tie on the votes which were legally admissible, as decided by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, every single No. 1 vote in the by-election was of tremendous value; even one vote was of tremendous value if it could be switched from the Country Party to the Liberal Party; or for that matter, vice versa.

Just in case the Minister might suggest that all the criticism of his action in this matter is coming from members of the Labor Party, I would like to take the opportunity of quoting the Country Party candidate, Mr. Owen; and this statement was reported in *The Sunday Times* of the 15th July, 1962. The article is headed, "Attack on Minister"; and then there is a subheading, "C.P. Man Critical." The article then goes on—

Country Party candidate for the vital and contentious Darling Range electorate, Mr. Ray Owen, has attacked Liberal Minister for Public Works, Mr. Wild. He said Mr. Wild showed a lack of propriety and was unfair in announcing Wattle Grove-Forrestfield's new £30,000 water scheme while speaking at a political rally in favour of Liberal candidate Mr. Ken Dunn.

I wish these newspapers, when they are talking about the Liberal Party Ministers and the Liberal Party would use the words "Liberal Party" and not just "Liberal"; because obviously there is all the difference in the world between a Liberal Minister and a Liberal Party Minister; and it would be much better for all concerned, I think, except the Ministers, if they were described as Liberal Party Ministers or Liberal Party members.

So there was no doubt about the feelings of Mr. Ray Owen at the rather startling and certainly unexpected declaration by

the Minister for Water Supplies at the Forrestfield meeting; and I would not be a bit surprised if there was not consternation amongst the Country Party members of the Ministry, and the private Country Party members of Parliament. I know there was consternation amongst many of the rank and file supporters in the Darling Range electorate, because they considered, and very justly considered in my view, that they were being doublecrossed by a Minister in a Government in which Ministers of their own were members.

They did not hesitate to say so in many directions. In fact, quite a number of them perhaps were undiplomatic enough to say what they thought in my presence, and that was before the by-election result was known. As a matter of fact, it was before the by-election actually took place. Clearly the declaration by the Minister for Water Supplies at Forrestfield, behind the back of his Country Party colleagues, was the master stroke in the campaign; it was the matter which decided the campaign; it was the issue which made it certain that the Country Party candidate could not win.

In conclusion, my feeling on this subject is that any Government made up in that way, and with individual Ministers acting in that way, cannot survive for very long. It might very well be that for the purposes of individual security in the political sense the coalition Government will remain for a while. But sooner or later, irrespective of what happens at Bunbury, I think the break must come; and when it does, I am certain the results which will flow from it will very greatly be to the advantage and benefit of the majority of people in this State.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara) [8.17 p.m.]: Perhaps one could say at this time that some people enjoy speaking and some have it thrust upon them. Once again we are at the stage where each and every member of the House has the opportunity to bring before Parliament some of the matters that affect him or his electorate, and I am certainly happy that I am able to take advantage of that opportunity.

Firstly, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on being re-elected to your present position. I should also like to congratulate the new Chairman of Committees, the member for Wellington; the new Ministers in the Government, the Minister for Police and the Minister for Education; the new members on both sides of the House; and the new Government Whip, the member for East Melville.

I should now like to touch on what is perhaps a Federal matter. There has just been a redistribution of Federal seats, and I believe that the State of Western Australia has not benefited as a result of that

redistribution, and the method by which it was carried out under the Commonwealth Electoral Act. It seems unrealistic to me, when we have a State that is increasing in population, as it must do as the years go by. I think that over the last ten years the State has made great strides; and it will continue to make them.

It seems a little unjust that at a time such as this, when a redistribution of Commonwealth seats is made, we lose one seat in this State; and therefore, as a result, one representative for this State in Canberra. I consider that the reason why the under-populated States in the past have had difficulty in attracting a great deal of attention from the Commonwealth Government has been the insufficient number of members who represent them in Canberra.

I believe that all members representing the State of Western Australia in the Commonwealth Parliament, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, should do everything they can to ensure that the representation of the various States in the House of Representatives is made more equal in some shape or other. Regardless of the party to which they belong, I think it is the duty of all members to strive for that objective.

I also believe that the Government of this State should press the Commonwealth Government for more equal representation in the House of Representatives. It may be possible for amendments to be made to the Commonwealth Constitution in order that this may take place, and representation should be made from each State to have this done on perhaps an area-population basis.

This State solved the problem of adequate representation for the North-West by ensuring that, regardless of the population figures, we maintain three seats in the North-West which, in area, approximates half the size of the State of Western Australia. Therefore I think that similar steps could be taken in the Commonwealth sphere to ensure that under-populated and under-developed areas are adequately represented in Canberra. At present we have the spectacle of the Kalgoorlie electorate being extended so that the population can reach the quota, despite the fact that it was big enough in area before the redistribution of seats took place. I think I am correct in saying that the area of the Kalgoorlie electorate is now well over 750,000 square miles.

It is just too stupid for anyone to imagine that one member could adequately represent the people living in that huge area. As we know, it is a case of "the squeaky wheel gets the most grease". By that I mean that with only one member representing the whole of that area, he does not obtain sufficient assistance in the Commonwealth Parliament to have

the necessary Commonwealth aid brought to the area he represents. We have the same set of circumstances in the Northern Territory and in some of the northern parts of Queensland; and I think those areas will always suffer until such time as steps are taken to even up the representation in the Commonwealth Parliament by reducing the number of members representing the over-populated areas and increasing the number of members who will represent the under-populated areas, on some form of area-population basis.

Until action of that kind is taken I feel sure that the under-populated parts of our State will not receive the consideration that is due to them from the Commonwealth Parliament. I repeat that I consider that to have one member representing an electorate the size of Kalgoorlie is ridiculous in the extreme.

Whilst on the matter of electoral questions, there are a few anomalies that exist in the administration of our Electoral Act; and I think that now is the appropriate time for them to be investigated. I have always felt that the distribution of *how to vote* cards outside polling booths by representatives of the various candidates is absolutely unnecessary and is somewhat embarrassing to the voters themselves. I do not think it is right and proper that anyone attending a polling booth should be swarmed upon by three, four, or up to a dozen representatives of the various political parties. In some cases there are as many as two or three representatives of the one party handing out *how to vote* cards.

It is only natural that this practice should be followed by the representatives of all parties. It would be unthinkable, of course, for only one party to stop this practice, and it would not be so intelligent from its point of view. However, I think that if our Electoral Act were amended to prohibit that practice it would be an advantage to everyone.

In line with that suggestion, I believe that it should be permissible to have party designations printed on the ballot paper. There is no good reason that I can think of why the party designations of the various candidates should not be shown on the ballot paper. If that were done, and a *how to vote* notice was displayed by each party within the polling booth, the necessity for the distribution of *how to vote* cards would no longer exist. Although one political party might not care to advocate such a reform, I feel certain that it would suit all parties in the long run because each would be treated equally; and the electors themselves, to my way of thinking, would be denied that harassing experience.

I have seen elderly people put to great pains by clutching their umbrellas whilst holding in their hands an advertisement that they have torn from a newspaper explaining to them how to vote for their own

political candidate; and they did not appreciate what was in store for them when they got to within 50 yards of the polling booth.

By the time they reached that point, about two representatives of each candidate pushed into their hands a couple of *how to vote* cards, and each voter finished up entering the door of the polling booth with an armful of paper. I am certain that that does nothing more than confuse the elector, and far more than he should be confused. A voter probably leaves home with his mind made up; but whether he enters the polling booth in the same state of mind, I sometimes have my doubts.

This is a state of affairs from which we could well move away, especially in these modern times; and, if we did so, it would not disadvantage any party. Perhaps the sooner it is done the better. In that regard, from time to time mention has also been made of another matter; namely, the circular ballot paper. With a name such as Bickerton, I have never really disagreed with the names of the candidates being printed on the ballot paper in alphabetical order, but I must admit that it can hardly be considered fair.

Mr. Nalder: It would be better if you had a surname like Arthur.

Mr. BICKERTON: I can see nothing wrong with a ballot paper of that kind; but I do not agree with the drawing of names to decide the order in which they shall appear on a ballot paper as against the system of their appearing in alphabetical order, because again it is a matter of luck as to which name comes out first. I think that these are matters that could be investigated with a view to amending our Electoral Act to effect improvements; and if there are good reasons against their being looked into, I would like to hear them. If these suggestions were implemented I do not think they would advantage any political party or, for that matter, disadvantage any political party.

A matter of extreme importance these days is that of iron ore, and many of us over the last two or three years have heard a great deal about the possible export of this mineral. This question arose in rather a strange way in the first place. I think one of my colleagues mentioned the other evening that it was rather strange the embargo on the export of iron ore was lifted only when Mr. Fadden became interested in the matter. Whether it had anything to do with his being the ex-Treasurer of the Commonwealth, I do not know. But I do know it is a fact that when he retired from Federal politics the embargo on the export of iron ore was considerably lifted. There has been much activity in my district with this mineral, and I would like first to deal briefly with the area around Mt. Goldsworthy.

In that deposit there is a considerable amount of what appears to be, up to date anyway, rather high-grade iron ore. Tenders were called for this, and a number of companies were interested. It was hoped at the time that this iron ore could be shipped through Port Hedland. I was hoping very much along these lines for the reason that it would have been necessary to install a deep-water port there of some description; and so it would have created an asset for the district to help serve other minerals from that area.

However, the tenderers all saw fit to ship the ore from other areas along the coast; and, accordingly, Port Hedland would naturally, in those circumstances, be robbed of its deep-water facilities. I was hoping that would not be the case, because we all know that mineral is a diminishing asset; and no matter how one goes about using it one must finish up with little less than a hole in the ground; and one's only chance is, whilst that industry is operating, to obtain some improvement which will be of a lasting nature in the district. So I was rather hoping that in this case it would have been a deep-water port at Port Hedland.

But with the successful tenderer choosing another point—and it looks as though this will be Depuch—I still think every effort should be made by the Government to obtain assets for the area from the royalties derived from that iron ore regardless of the port from which it is shipped.

Various councils in my area are also of that opinion. They feel they want to finish up with something more than a hole in the ground. They did move a motion along these lines at their last meeting. I wrote to the Minister for Industrial Development on this matter, but I have not heard from him. I wrote my letter on the 7th June; and as I have received no reply up to date I take this opportunity of mentioning it when speaking to the debate on the Address-in-Reply, in the hope that if the Minister has mislaid my letter, or if it has been hidden away somewhere in a little basket, he may be able to give me some information on it during this session of Parliament.

Mr. Court: Did I not acknowledge it, and did you not write back and thank me for acknowledging it so quickly?

Mr. BICKERTON: No; the Minister may have acknowledged it, but if he did he certainly did not post the letter because I did not receive it.

Mr. Court: I think I got one back from you.

Mr. BICKERTON: I admit the Minister is possibly a very busy man, and I have written two or three letters; so it could be one of the others which has been acknowledged by him. From the remark

made by the Minister I think it is possible he is thinking of a letter concerning the pastoralists and graziers' association:

In my letter to the Minister of the 7th June I said—

I enclose copy of resolution passed at the last meeting of the Pilbara Ward, dealing with the monies derived from mineral royalties—particularly iron-ore.

You will note that the request is that these royalties be spent on selected Pilbara projects.

I think you will agree that many examples exist, both in the Pilbara and Murchison areas, where great mineral wealth has been gained from these areas in the past, and little remains by way of local benefits to show for it.

I am aware that your Government endeavoured to have the Goldsworthy iron-ore deposits shipped through Port Hedland, which involved certain harbour improvements as a condition of tender.

I am also aware that tenderers for the project found the Port Hedland proposition uneconomic to them and submitted alternative points of shipping.

My opinion is that whilst the tenderers are probably right as far as their submissions are concerned, a permanent deep water port at Port Hedland to serve the manganese and other minerals industry is still advisable and desirable.

This could be one project on which the royalties from iron-ore in the area could be used to supply a lasting and valuable asset.

Special grants for water exploration and conservation projects and to finance selected geophysical and geological teams to work in the area could be other means by which the area would gain increased development and lasting benefit.

I request that you give this matter your earnest consideration.

I was hoping that the royalties from this iron ore would be used to give us something of lasting benefit in that area. We did not want to find ourselves, in 10 or 15 years' time, in a position after these people have finished taking the iron ore under the lease they hold, where the railway lines and port facilities used for the purpose were sold, and we were merely left with a few foundations here and there to show that at one time or another some form of industry had existed in the area. That must be avoided at all costs, or we will be repeating mistakes we have made in the past in so far as our mineral wealth is concerned.

There is another aspect concerning this iron ore which worries me a little, and it is this: When it was first decided to call tenders for various projects in this area I noted there were a number of big mining companies interested. To name a few, there was Rio Tinto, Consolidated Zinc, Chrysler Corporation, and other companies of that nature. I was hoping there would be at least five or six big companies which were interested in these iron ore deposits.

Recently, however, an amalgamation seems to have come about among quite a number of these companies, which causes me at times to have some fear that the competition which I thought originally existed might no longer exist. We should be rather careful that we do not have iron ore reserves in this area controlled by possibly a single monopoly. I have no doubt it would be to the advantage of the Government, and to the advantage of these companies to have some form of amalgamation, particularly from their point of view, because it would save them competing the one against the other.

But we would get to the stage where competition ceased to exist; and if, as has happened, these companies take up large reserves in their own right, and then amalgamate into one huge company covering practically all those iron ore reserves, they literally have a monopoly, which I was hoping we could avoid.

Mr. Court: There are at least three big competing groups which are quite independent of each other.

Mr. BICKERTON: I am not aware of that. I know there is an amalgamation between some of the companies operating in the Hamersley area and the Mt. Goldsworthy area. An amalgamation was suggested between those two groups. When I speak of the Hamersley area I am referring very broadly to all the iron ore in that locality, plus what is further up north in the Mt. Goldsworthy area. If there is an amalgamation between those groups, and they are granted the leases, then they would cover most of the iron ore reserves in the area. The Minister assures me that is not the case, and there is still plenty of competition between them. My fears will be lessened when he proves it to me.

Mr. Court: That is a consideration upon which the Government has been careful to insist. There are at least three major and separate groups.

Mr. BICKERTON: I sincerely hope the Government will ensure that is the case all along, otherwise we would be back to where we were with B.H.P.

There is another matter on which I would like some assurance from the Minister, possibly at a later stage. I refer to the provision by the private companies of

the facilities for handling and transporting the iron ore. This is rather a new one on me. I always thought that the provision of railway lines, ports, port installations and the like was the job of the Government, and not the job of private companies within a country.

There is this disadvantage when calling for tenders which are so embracing: If the successful tenderer is required to establish his own railway line, port facilities, and installations which go with the port, then we will reduce the number of companies which are financially capable of tendering. So we would restrict the price which could be obtained as a result of a particular tender being called.

If the Government were to install those facilities—the railway lines and the port facilities—and then call tenders for the production and cartage of the ore, we would open up a much larger field from which tenderers could be drawn. I have no doubt that by so doing many small companies would be able to tender, where it would be quite impossible for them to do so when the conditions of the tender laid down that the successful tenderer had to install a railway line, a port, port facilities, and so on. That would undoubtedly be beyond the financial ability of many small companies. However, the Minister might be able to prove that his proposal would work. I suppose we all want to try somewhere along the line to exploit the iron ore reserves, but on this occasion I am not as happy as some people seem to be.

Mr. Court: If we do not exploit the iron ore this way the Pilbara reserves will not be explored and exploited in our lifetime.

Mr. BICKERTON: That is the opinion of the Minister; it is one with which I do not agree. I cannot see the difference between having the facilities installed firstly, and then calling the tenders afterwards; and proceeding in the way the Government is proceeding by calling tenders first and requiring the successful tenderer to install the facilities.

Mr. Court: From where would the Government get £12,000,000?

Mr. BICKERTON: From where did the Minister get the money for the commencement of the standard gauge railway line to Fremantle? Where does any Government get £12,000,000 from? It is a matter upon which the Government does some research in finding ways and means of raising the £12,000,000. If the advancement of Australia depended up to date solely on the availability of £12,000,000 to the Government, there would be no advancement, because people would ask from where would the money come.

Mr. Court: We are showing you how we can speed the process up, and carry out both things.

Mr. BICKERTON: I am all for speeding up the process, but I do not want to be sorry afterwards. I do not mind expressing at this stage a few of my fears as to what will happen when complete control is given over to an organisation, particularly when I read the reports in the newspapers. I can only go on them because it is pretty difficult to obtain information as far as the department is concerned. When there is a possibility of the companies which are operating separately coming together and amalgamating, and so controlling the whole of the iron ore reserves, I am entitled to bring my fears before this Parliament.

As stated by the Minister, and from Press reports, these companies are supplying all the money for the establishment of the railway line and the port facilities. The Minister said the reason for that was that the Government could not find the £12,000,000 required. Let us consider how much we as a State are to pay for this expenditure of £12,000,000 by the companies. This resolves itself into a question of whether it would be better for the Government to borrow the money and outlay it in establishing the railway line and port facilities, or whether it would be better for some company to install them and then charge the State a very high price, if not to ourselves then to the generations of the future. I cannot bring myself to believe that the State would get all those facilities for nothing.

Considerable play has been made on the fact that this iron ore will be explored, exploited, and exported at no cost to the taxpayer. I cannot fall for that one.

Mr. Court: In fact they will pay the taxpayer something.

Mr. BICKERTON: I cannot agree with that opinion at all. Private companies rely on their shareholders for finance. Boards of directors are appointed to look after that finance. No-one can convince me that there are in any company, large or small, directors big enough to say, "As a Government you need not worry at all. We will put in for nothing a railway line, a port, and port facilities. That is all there is to the matter. In addition we will give you a few shillings for the minerals we take out." Such a course of action would not take place.

Mr. Court: Wait till you see the agreement. That is what has happened.

Mr. BICKERTON: The Minister could not possibly be naïve enough to overlook this fact: What is the company getting out of that iron ore? It is obvious the company will not give the Government anything.

Mr. Court: I gather you have not seen the agreement.

Mr. BICKERTON: It stands to reason, if a company is asked to tender a royalty for the export of iron ore; and, at the same time, as a condition of the tender is required to build a railway line, a port, port facilities, and handling facilities, it would work out the cost of those installations as well as the cost of testing the ore, loading the ore, blasting the ore, deepening channels, and all the rest. Having worked out the cost, and having added a margin of profit—which is natural enough for any company to do—what remains is what the company can afford to pay a royalty on to the Government.

Let us assume the company pays £X as royalty. If the Government were to establish the railway line, the port facilities, and all the rest, then the cost of providing these things would not be taken into account in the tender price; in that case the royalty would be £X plus another amount, equal to the cost of those installations.

It is ridiculous to suggest that a company will pay the State for the pleasure of exporting the iron ore, and that the taxpayer will not have to find one single penny. We know very well it costs the taxpayer something. If and when the Minister introduces the Bill to ratify the agreement he should avoid punishing us by saying that these companies are really giving the State 2s., 3s. or 5s. a ton for the ore for absolutely nothing; and that, in effect, they are a Father Christmas.

We know our iron ore is paying that royalty; it is putting in the railway facilities and the port facilities. We can be very happy the company is doing it as it is advancement for the State. We want to see it; but please do not think we are so childish as to believe we are getting it all for nothing.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [8.51 p.m.]: I wish to take advantage of this motion to deal with a few subjects which are of considerable public importance. The first is in connection with some questions which I asked yesterday regarding metered properties in the metropolitan area. The Minister informed me, in reply to a question, that there were 21,350 improved properties, including business areas, in Perth and Fremantle, which were still unmetered. How on earth it is possible to have a pay-as-you-use system for water on the basis that one pays a basic rate for water and then pays for the excess one uses when 21,000 properties are unmetered, I do not know.

Mr. Wild: Would you have put a meter on Boans or Zimpels if you were the Minister?

Mr. TONKIN: Is the Minister suggesting the majority of these are business premises?

Mr. Wild: Yes, mostly in the city of Perth.

Mr. TONKIN: It is a strange thing, if that is so, that the number given in reply to the previous question is as stated. The question was, "How many properties which were unmetered had meters installed during the year"; and the reply was: 12,843, a few of which were other than domestic. If the lag in meters was so great as to require the installation during the year of 12,000 meters on properties which were almost wholly domestic, how does it come about we have a figure of 21,350 properties which are still unmetered when I think, speaking from memory, the figure the Minister gave for unmetered properties last year was less than 6,000?

Mr. Wild: You will find most of these are business premises. As you well know, it would be useless metering some premises—quite a number in Subiaco, for instance.

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Minister be helpful to this extent and say approximately how many domestic properties are still unmetered?

Mr. Wild: I could not give that information off the cuff, but if you like to ask I will soon find out for you.

Mr. TONKIN: It seems to me—

Mr. Wild: We have taken up the lag considerably during the last two or three years. We have stepped up the purchase of meters to twice as much as ever before.

Mr. TONKIN:—that if this system is to work properly at all, all properties will have to be metered because the quantity available for the basic rate has been reduced by more than one third. So it is almost impossible for anybody to get through without using more than the basic quantity. I say that from a wide experience of many hundreds of users in the metropolitan area. I know of pensioners who have scarcely any garden at all, and a pocket handkerchief lawn, yet they still ran into excess.

Mr. Wild: From memory I think approximately 40 per cent. of the people last year did not go into excess.

Mr. TONKIN: We will see about that when the Minister gives me the figures later. For some strange reason, information which I was able to obtain in the first week of the session last year regarding the departmental accounts was not available this year, even though the accounts were closed off at the 30th June.

Mr. Wild: The accountant had been away sick. He had an operation. I think that probably was the hold-up.

Mr. TONKIN: If very few of the people run into excess, the Minister is going to have a tremendous deficit in his revenue account. He must, because the basic rate was so calculated that the revenue from that source was reduced by one third; and the department was depending upon the sale of excess water in order to make up

the loss in revenue which resulted from reducing the rate in the pound from 1s. 6d. to 1s.

If that be the position, it is obvious that the department faces the necessity of having to put up the water rates next year; because, as the Minister well knows, it cannot lose money for any great length of time. It will have to impose a rate which will ensure a return to it of the necessary revenue to cover the cost of running the undertaking. If the money has not been obtained as a result of the sale of excess water, then it is inevitable that the revenue is considerably down. If that means a further increase in rates, then I say it is completely unjustified.

Mr. Wild: I think you will find there will not be an increase.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister cannot have it both ways. He cannot say that sales of excess water were down and yet there was no loss of revenue, because he lost one third of his revenue by a reduction in the basic rate.

Mr. Wild: I did not say there was a loss in revenue. I did not make that statement at all.

Mr. TONKIN: No; I am making it up!

Mr. Wild: I say you will be quite surprised when you know the result.

Mr. TONKIN: Does the Minister say that in reducing the rate from 1s. 6d. in the pound to 1s. in the pound the department did not lose revenue?

Mr. Wild: What it lost on the swings it made up on the merry-go-round because certain people like to waste water and use a lot more.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister said excess water consumption was down.

Mr. Wild: You wait until you see the results. You will find there will be little or no loss of revenue.

Mr. TONKIN: It has to be one thing or the other. Last year the revenue for the department was made up of basic rate and the money paid for excess water, and the two figures together gave a certain amount of net revenue. This year the basic rate was reduced from 1s. 6d. in the pound to 1s. in the pound for all domestic consumers. That has inevitably meant a reduction of approximately one third in revenue derived from the basic rate, having regard to new properties which have been metered. To make that up it was essential to obtain more money from the sale of excess water than was obtained the previous year; but the Minister says it was less. So I will leave that question until we get the figures. I would like to make this comment before I leave the subject: The member for South Perth mentioned here last evening that he made inquiries at the Metropolitan Water Supply Department to find out the consumption of water in South Perth and he was told it

was much less. How on earth he could be told that, I do not know; because the Minister's reply to a question by me says that South Perth was one of the districts where the meters were not read until after the election.

Mr. Grayden: That was not the statement at all. I talked about the money derived from the district.

Mr. TONKIN: Money is derived by the sale of excess water; and how does the honourable member know how much excess water is used before the meters are read? The meters were not read until the April-June quarter, so the Minister told me.

Mr. Grayden: The figures were obtained during the election campaign and were quoted.

Mr. TONKIN: I did not hear what the member for South Perth said. I am dealing with information supplied to me here. I asked what districts were covered by meter readers during the April-June quarter, and I was given a list of districts, South Perth being one of them. Therefore if the meters were not read in South Perth until after the election, it would be impossible for anyone to tell the honourable member how much money was received from South Perth by way of the sale of excess water.

Mr. Grayden: I will get the figures for you.

Mr. TONKIN: You can get what you like.

Mr. Brand: Get the figures. That is what he wants.

Mr. TONKIN: I am very disturbed with the housing position in view of the statements made by the Premier and others. When we on this side of the House kept drawing attention to the fact that nothing was being done by the Government to provide for the employment of apprentices, we were assured, every time, that the Government was watching the position. Every time we endeavoured to point out to the Government that the situation was worsening, firstly, because of the disbandment of the Public Works Department work force; and, secondly, because of the new method of putting up buildings under subcontracting, we were fobbed off with the answer that the Government was carefully watching the position.

But what did we find subsequently? When an expert committee was set up for the purpose of going into this question of apprentices, it drew attention to the very things we had been drawing attention to for two years; and it was obvious that the Government had done nothing about them; and it is equally obvious, so far as I can see, that it is doing very little about it now.

Mr. Brand: Is it not better to get a limited number of essential key men in order to enable us to employ unskilled people?

Mr. TONKIN: And allow them to live in mi-mi-las?

Mr. Toms: The skilled people go East. Mr. Brand: They used to go over to the East while you were on this side of the House but they are coming back now.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. Brand: Because they know the State is well governed now.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. TONKIN: With regard to purchase of rental homes already, and 78 emergent cases awaiting housing, I think we are entitled to be told something more than that the Government is planning to meet the situation.

Mr. Brand: You will be shown in due course.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, of course. That is the same old answer: We will be shown in due course.

Mr. Brand: We didn't say that.

Mr. TONKIN: Oh no, of course you did not; but the builders did.

Mr. Brand: You talk to the builders.

Mr. TONKIN: The organisation told these individual builders who were complaining that they were going to lose a considerable sum of money; that they must not say anything about it because it would be damaging to the Government—despite the fact that when these contracts were taken away from those who had them, and were then let by tender to other people, they were let at prices which in some cases were £600 above the initial contract prices, and at figures which would not have been entertained had they been tendered originally.

But, of course, some individuals have to carry a loss; and when they try to obtain redress they are told, "Do not say anything about it; it will damage the Government."

Mr. Brand: We could not get any support from the unions.

Mr. Fletcher: Don't blame the unions.

Mr. TONKIN: Now we are told—

Mr. Brand: Have you any comment on the fact that we could not get any support from the unions concerning the recommendations of the committee.

Mr. Fletcher: You never gave any encouragement to them to start off with.

Mr. Brand: Your Deputy Leader is holding it up as a—

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. TONKIN: What I am saying is—

Mr. Brand: We could never get any support from the people who should support us.

Mr. Toms: Rubbish!

Mr. Brand: You think up another word.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. TONKIN: Over a period of years in reply to questions raised by the members on this side of the House, the Government kept telling us that it was watching the position. That is now what I am being told in regard to housing—it is watching the position. This is how it is watching: Members are aware of what an emergent case means. I have had a few myself. When an application is approved as an emergent case, we can be sure it is really urgent.

According to figures supplied to me yesterday, there are at present 78 emergent cases awaiting houses for immediate occupation. There is a lag of from five months to two years and four months in the applications for rental homes. Yet a mission has gone overseas to encourage migrant tradesmen and to guarantee them housing. When I asked what steps are being taken to meet that situation, I was fobbed off with this—

The Government has set out to obtain the services of specialised tradesmen and it is realised that housing must be made available and the Government is planning to this end.

When I asked what it is doing about it I received no information. Yet there are 78 emergent cases here now that cannot be satisfied. Some of them after being approved as emergent cases have to wait weeks under existing conditions before they can be put into a house.

Mr. Brand: Do you suggest we should not get the tradesmen?

Mr. TONKIN: I am suggesting that it is imperative we provide adequate housing for the people who are here before we start guaranteeing housing to people who are not yet here.

Mr. Brand: Didn't they make their tender? They weren't able to carry it out.

Mr. TONKIN: They told me they were able to carry it out, but they were not given the opportunity.

Mr. Brand: I don't know the details of it.

Mr. TONKIN: So, to improve the situation, the houses stood idle for three weeks.

Mr. Brand: And tenders were called again.

Mr. TONKIN: I am pleased the Minister for Industrial Development has resumed his seat, because I propose to have something to say about the magnificent assistance given to Mr. Cavanagh. When Mr. Cavanagh complained that he had to go out of Australia in order to obtain necessary financial assistance for a project in which he was interested, the Minister came into the Press and tried to create the impression that Mr. Cavanagh had been given wonderful financial assistance and had really nothing to complain about.

Mr. Court: Did I say that?

Mr. TONKIN: Yes you did; but not those exact words.

Mr. Court: I know I didn't say anything like that.

Mr. TONKIN: You implied that.

Mr. Court: They didn't have anything to complain about; and I am sure Mr. Cavanagh will tell you he didn't have anything to complain about. He has been very well treated and is very well satisfied.

Mr. TONKIN: So well treated that he found it necessary to sell his proposition overseas—in Holland! We will have a look at this assistance he was given. It amounts to peanuts.

Mr. Court: He didn't think so; neither did his directors.

Mr. TONKIN: My question was as follows:—

- (1) What was the total sum involved in payment of accounts for experimental work for analytical chemist, Mr. John Cavanagh, in connection with the development of his new protein-refining process?

The answer was: £107 18s. 7d. . . .

Mr. Court: You read the rest.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes—

. . . apart from research undertaken at the request of the Department of Industrial Development by the Government Chemical Laboratories and not charged.

Apart from that £107 18s. 7d.

Mr. Court: Tell us the vote that was given for assistance.

Mr. TONKIN: When I remember that during the time I was Minister a proposition was put to me seriously by the Principal Architect that I should make available £5,000 to enable a contractor to go and look for Donnybrook stone, I am amazed at this magnanimous assistance for a project of this nature.

Mr. Court: Are you going to read the next part, about the vote that was given for research?

Mr. TONKIN: The next part reads—

Approval had been given for expenditure to a maximum of £2,000 on experimental work for a period of 12 months from the 22nd September, 1960.

But I understand the tags applied to that were such that it could not be undertaken.

Mr. Court: That is not so; all the work he wanted done was done.

Mr. Brand: Where did you get the information about the tags? Not from the newspaper.

Mr. TONKIN: No; but I got the lead from the newspaper.

Mr. Brand: I thought you gave the House to understand that you read it in the newspaper.

Mr. TONKIN: The second part of the question was—

When did Mr. Cavanagh make his request for financial assistance from the department?

The answer was—

There have been a series of requests and discussions dating back to the 13th July, 1960. These include requests for technical as well as financial assistance. The latest request currently under consideration was made on the 19th July, 1962.

The third part of the question was—

Will he table all papers in connection with Mr. Cavanagh's application?

I never, for one moment, entertained the idea that the Minister would agree to this, because he never does. If one asks the Minister for Industrial Development to table papers, he will always be able to find some excuse for not doing it. I cannot recall a single instance when I have asked him for papers that he did not refuse point blank to make them available, or impose such conditions that it was impossible for any member to take advantage of them.

But, of course, he asked for papers to be tabled when he was on this side of the House; and he put on a show, too, if he could not get them tabled. He thought it right and proper, when on this side of the House, to ask for papers to be tabled—as, indeed, it is, if there is nothing

to hide. But not in a single instance has he made papers available to me—nor will he. So he gives this answer—

It is not usual to make available confidential papers of this nature as this would destroy public confidence in submissions to the department.

It would make no difference if I obtained the sanction of Mr. Cavanagh to ask for this. The Minister would still find some other answer. The proof is this: I ask the Minister now, if I obtain Mr. Cavanagh's concurrence to have these papers made public, will he table them?

Mr. Court: Mr. Cavanagh and his directors—there is a whole group of people in this venture, not only Mr. Cavanagh.

Mr. TONKIN: I cannot imagine that Mr. Cavanagh would give his concurrence without consulting his directors. If I can obtain Mr. Cavanagh's concurrence after he has consulted his directors, will the Minister make the papers available?

Mr. Court: I will make them available to you, but I am not going to table confidential papers in this House. If you can get his permission you can see them with pleasure.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, I can see them on the condition that I say nothing about them.

Mr. Court: The papers contain information about his process. Surely, you don't want that to be made public. It would destroy public confidence in the department.

Mr. TONKIN: It would not. If the person concerned is prepared to allow the papers to be tabled, how would that destroy public confidence? We can be sure that the Minister for Industrial Development will find some reason why the papers should not be tabled—

Mr. Court: You ask Mr. Cavanagh.

Mr. TONKIN: —if it is likely that, as a result, there would be grounds for criticism.

Mr. Court: I am sure you won't get Mr. Cavanagh to say that we have been anything but generous, and most reasonable.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister should read the newspaper article. It is not easy to get the newspapers to take that line. Surely the Minister will have appreciated that.

Mr. Court: I have not appreciated that.

Mr. TONKIN: It has been my experience. It is not easy for me to get a letter published in the paper.

Mr. Court: You ask Mr. Cavanagh whether he is satisfied. Ask Mr. Cavanagh himself and his directors. They will say they are more than satisfied.

Mr. TONKIN: They had to go out of the country to do anything with the proposition.

Mr. Court: Well, that is their own business. We didn't make them do that.

Mr. TONKIN: The reason they did so was that they could not make any headway in Australia.

Mr. Court: Because there were certain facilities available in Holland which were not available here. We have not lost anything out of this. We still have the Australian and nearby rights for all this if we can make the process work.

Mr. TONKIN: I now propose to come to another subject which concerns the Minister for Industrial Development, and that is the sale of the State Building Supplies. The Minister will not concede what the Auditor-General stated to be a fact: that the State Building Supplies were sold for £1,000,000.

Mr. Court: Some of the assets were sold for £1,000,000.

Mr. TONKIN: Never mind about some of the assets of the State Building Supplies.

Mr. Court: You are not going to tell us that that £1,000,000 includes new stock and the book debts?

Mr. TONKIN: No, I am not going to tell the Minister; I am going to let the Auditor-General do that.

Mr. Court: I have too much respect for his knowledge to think he will tell you that.

Mr. TONKIN: I do not think he misleads Parliament; I am sure he does not do that. On page 247 of the 71st report he made this statement—

Disposal of State Building Supplies.

By agreement between the Western Australian Government Railways Commission as vendor and the State Building Supplies as purchaser, the purchaser, as at midnight on the 30th June, 1961, acquired the whole of the right, title and interest of the vendor in its mill known as Banksiadale Mill, for the price of £250,000, such price to be paid as agreed upon by the parties or, in the event of disagreement, as directed by the Treasurer.

That is apart from the State Building Supplies; and so, having noted that, we can disregard it for the time being. He went on—

Under an agreement, operative from the 1st July, 1961, the Hon. Treasurer, on behalf of the State, agreed to dispose of the State Building Supplies to Hawker Siddeley Building Supplies Pty. Ltd.

Under the agreement which is for a term of 21 years commencing on the 1st July, 1961, the purchaser agrees—

- (1) to purchase all assets except trading stocks, works in progress, sundry debtors and cash balances for £A1,000,000.

Mr. Court: Now you have got it right!

Mr. TONKIN: Of course I have got it right. One does not purchase cash.

Mr. Court: He said "except," and you read out all the things he said.

Mr. TONKIN: But they are not the State Building Supplies. The cash balances are not the State Building Supplies.

Mr. Court: What about the stocks and the book debts. They are all part of the business.

Mr. TONKIN: But the book debts were not purchased. The Minister knows that.

Mr. Court: You have been trying to tell us that they got the lot for £1,000,000.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister knows the book debts were not purchased.

Mr. Court: They are just collected on our behalf. Right throughout, as you did the other Sunday morning, you have been trying to give the impression that they got the lot for £1,000,000.

Mr. TONKIN: No. I am stating precisely what the Auditor-General said. That is what I am telling the Minister—just what the Auditor-General said.

Mr. Court: I am happy to take his word.

Mr. TONKIN: One does not buy cash balances.

Mr. Court: That is fair enough.

Mr. TONKIN: I cannot imagine anyone buying £1,000 of cash balances for any sum greater than or less than £1,000, so we have to put that aside. The agreement specifically states that the book debts were not purchased, so we have to put that aside.

Mr. Court: And we get the money from them.

Mr. TONKIN: Of course we do.

Mr. Court: Right oh! So long as you agree on that.

Mr. TONKIN: Of course we do, but we do not get it all at once.

Mr. Court: We get it when the debt is paid; and we have got it as they have paid.

Mr. TONKIN: That is not stated here.

Mr. Court: Yes. It was £384,000 to the 30th June, 1962.

Mr. TONKIN: Has the Government got the money?

Mr. Court: Of course we have it! We get it every month without fail, right on the dot.

Mr. TONKIN: Then the Treasurer will be showing it in his accounts.

Mr. Court: Of course he will.

Mr. TONKIN: I will be looking for it.

Mr. Court: The Auditor-General will be looking for it, too.

Mr. TONKIN: The Government has him in a fog, because he is not yet—nearly two years afterwards—able to tell us what the impact has been on the State finances—

Mr. Court: He has not presented his report yet.

Mr. TONKIN: That is what I was told. This is beyond the 30th June, and he had this to say in his last report—

The conditions of the sale and those conditions relating to employment and accrued leave are such that it is impracticable at this date to make a reasonable assessment of the impact on the State finances. It will be seen from the terms of the agreements that some considerable time must elapse before finality is reached.

I gave him 12 months, and yesterday I asked this question—

- (1) Has it been possible yet for the Auditor-General to make any assessment of the impact on the State finances of the sale of State Building Supplies to Hawker Siddeley?

- (2) If so, what are the conclusions which have been arrived at?

The answer was—

- (1) and (2) The accounts of the State Building Supplies have not yet been finalised.

Mr. Court: That is fair enough.

Mr. TONKIN: So another 12 months have gone by and the Auditor-General is not yet in a position to assess the impact of the sale on the State's finances. Therefore it shows what a great stroke of business it was!

Mr. Court: I do not believe he will be able to gauge it as yet, having regard to what has taken place since.

Mr. TONKIN: When does he usually table his report? It is about September. In his report last year he stated that under the agreement the company was—

- (2) to purchase brick stocks and works in progress at the 30th June, 1961 valuations;
- (3) to purchase general store trading stocks at a mutually agreed or independently determined valuation.
- (4) to accept timber and hardware stocks on consignment and to pay for stocks disposed of at book values less a discount of 10 per cent. up to the first £250,000 inclusive of the said discount and the balance at book values less

discounts of 25 per cent. for karri stocks and 20 per cent. for other stocks.

That seemed to me to be a pretty generous offer, but it was not good enough. There has been another valuation since, and they have all been handed over at a much lesser value, and in precisely the way I mentioned here last year when I was told that that was not happening.

Mr. Court: We did very well out of this final clean-up—better than we thought.

Mr. TONKIN: When I said here last year that they were going around picking the eyes out of the stock, I was told, "Oh no, that is not what is happening at all".

Mr. Court: It didn't matter if they did. Under the settlement we made we got a complete global sum that removed any problems of accounting whatever.

Mr. TONKIN: Of course one can remove any problems if one gives the stuff away; and that is what was done.

Mr. Court: We got much more than we expected to get.

Mr. TONKIN: That does not seem to be the case at all, because the Government got much less than what is stated here, and it got a figure considerably less than appeared in the balance sheet.

Mr. Court: But do you know the condition of some of those karri stocks?

Mr. TONKIN: I know the Auditor-General stated that in his opinion they were conservatively priced.

Mr. Court: He would not say so now. I am sure he has changed his mind.

Mr. TONKIN: We will see what he does say in due course. It has been frequently argued that this was a good stroke of business; and that by getting rid of the State Building Supplies, which were running at a loss, the Government was going to be better off. Of course, it is not better off. In fact, it is considerably worse off, as can be seen from a perusal of this information. I asked the question—

Compared with the financial year ended the 30th June, 1961, to what extent was the State Revenue Fund deprived of benefit from the operations of State Building Supplies because of the sale of that enterprise?

That is a fair enough question, and here is the answer I received—

In the financial year 1960-61 the State Building Supplies contributed £175,565 to Consolidated Revenue on account of interest, sinking fund, and employers' share of superannuation. In the same year, the concern's loss of £35,371 for 1959-60 was charged to Consolidated Revenue.

So there is a net gain to revenue of £140,000, whilst the State Building Supplies belonged to the Government. Let

us see what happened in 1961-62 when they no longer belonged to the Government. An amount of £36,000 was paid into Consolidated Revenue, being interest received from Hawker Siddeley on the balance of the purchase price; and £5,125 was taken into revenue on account of the employers' share of superannuation for the quarter ended the 30th June, 1961. That is a total of £41,000 that went into revenue. An amount of £68,858 was charged to Consolidated Revenue, being the loss for 1960-61 of the State Building Supplies.

So the loss on the previous year of £68,000 was charged against Consolidated Revenue. Of course, when there is no *contra* a situation is created because instead of getting £175,000 from the concern as revenue, as was obtained in the previous year, it got £41,000, and that situation will continue year after year. That is, the State will continue to lose approximately £130,000 every year because it still has to find interest and sinking fund on the loan capital which is in excess of £2,000,000. What will be obtained from Hawker-Siddeley for 20 years will not repay that, or even half of it, and the balance will remain, upon which interest will have to be charged and found from some other source because the State Building Supplies no longer exists to pay it. If that is a good stroke of business it surprises me.

Mr. Court: And we do not have to find any more loan funds to keep capitalising this State concern.

Mr. TONKIN: No wonder, when Mr. Gregson made his final report to Parliament, he said that once the Government made up its mind to sell, a sale price was a secondary consideration; and Mr. Gregson was a supporter of the Government. However, this was too much for him to swallow.

Mr. Court: Who said he was a supporter of the Government?

Mr. TONKIN: I know he is.

Mr. Court: You know more than we know.

Mr. TONKIN: Of course! Don't be ridiculous!

Mr. Court: I think you are being unfair to him.

Mr. TONKIN: I am not being unfair to him, because it is obvious.

Mr. Court: As far as we know, it has not been made public, nor has it been made known to us. He is one man who has always been an honest and straightforward servant to any Government, your Government as well as ours.

Mr. TONKIN: That does not disprove the claim that he is a strong Liberal. He is not the only Liberal who has been in Government employ. Surely he is not ashamed to own up to it.

Mr. Court: I am not saying that he is.

Mr. TONKIN: Well, what are you grizzling about?

Mr. Court: I hope he is a good Liberal, because he is a good chap and a very straightforward and honourable man.

Mr. TONKIN: I cannot imagine a Labor man being a liaison officer for the private sawmillers.

Mr. Court: He could be.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister has a very strong imagination. There is a situation where obviously a strong supporter of the Liberal Government found that he could not let this matter go without comment as a good servant would, I believe, be expected to do. So he said—I cannot quote his exact words—

Mr. Court: I think it is rather important that you do quote his exact words.

Mr. TONKIN: Of course, the Minister does not want me to say anything, but I am going to say these words subject to slight alteration which may be necessary to get the exact verbiage. What he said, in effect, was this: that he assumed the Government was aware of the cost of the decision it had made. His next statement was that once the decision on policy was made the sale price was a secondary consideration.

Mr. Court: He also said that we made the right decision in selecting the firm that we did.

Mr. TONKIN: Having decided to give it away, they were the right people to give it to. I would not disagree with the Minister on that. Having decided to give it away all the Government had to do was to select the right person to give it to. What difference does that make to what I am saying?

There is one final question. Last year I drew attention to the fact—perhaps it was the year before, when the Act was being amended—that, in my opinion, too heavy an impost was being placed on motorists in order to gain money to be used as matching money for the purpose of obtaining a greater amount of money from the Commonwealth. I expressed the opinion that the amount of money in this fund would continue to grow because we were taking too much from our own people and we would not be able to get the necessary matching money for the whole of it, nor would we be able to spend it.

I made the forecast at the time that the amount which would be in credit this year would be greater than the amount in credit last year; but, at the time, the Minister pooh-poohed the idea. Let us have a look at these figures. I asked the question—

What was the amount of the credit in the Central Road Trust Fund at the 30th June, 1962?

And the answer was £2,112,158. Out of that trust fund each year money has to be paid in three directions in accordance with section 11A of the Traffic Act. Firstly, it has to be paid to local authorities not within the metropolitan area; secondly, to local authorities within the metropolitan area; and, thirdly, to the King's Park Board.

Out of that amount of £2,000,000 in the fund the full disbursements had been made to each of these three organisations; namely, £518,385 12s. 4d. to local authorities not within the metropolitan area; £425,279 15s. to local authorities within the metropolitan area; and £2,567 5s. to the King's Park Board. So that less than £1,000,000—almost £1,000,000, but less than £1,000,000, the full amount to which these organisations are entitled—has been paid from that fund, leaving the balance of £1,112,000 which will continue to grow, because of the conditions, thus justifying my criticism of the Bill, that the impost being placed on the motorist in the metropolitan area in this State was a greater impost than was necessary in order to enable the State to get money it could spend under this section of the Act.

But, of course, I was like a voice crying in the wilderness. The Government does not take any notice of what is said, be it good, bad, or indifferent. It goes along its merry way, and the only answer one can get is, "Do not worry; we are watching the position." It reminds me of the man sitting on a stump watching his house burn.

Mr. Brand: It reminds me of your answer to certain questions concerning resumptions in George Street when you said, "We are watching the position."

Mr. TONKIN: Let the Premier turn that answer up. It will not be easy to find.

Mr. Brand: I will have a look.

Mr. TONKIN: I hope the Premier will have a look.

Mr. Brand: You said, "We are watching the position."

Mr. TONKIN: That is what the Premier is saying now. Will he be man enough to admit that he is wrong if he cannot find that answer?

Mr. Brand: I always have been.

Mr. TONKIN: That will be a new experience for me; and the Premier knows it. I said that was my final subject; but a remark the Premier has just made has reminded me of something with which I shall deal. I should hope that the Premier will remember this.

When Mr. Watts was Attorney-General he introduced into Parliament last year an amendment to the Police Act to make it possible to control pin-ball machines. I raised the question at the time and said I was afraid that action would be taken against harmless amusement machines

which were in no way being used for gambling. Members who were here will recall my doing that.

I was given an unequivocal assurance by the Attorney-General that the police could be trusted in this matter, and that there was no intention of banning harmless amusement machines. Imagine my amazement, Mr. Acting Speaker (Mr. W. A. Manning) when, as soon as Parliament rose, regulations were promulgated doing the very thing which the Attorney-General assured me would not be done. What sort of conduct is that?

Members complained here last year because I reminded them of assurances which were given and broken and when I said I would not accept the word of anyone on that side of the House because of my experience. And here was another one. If anyone doubts my word let him turn up *Hansard* and read for himself the assurance which the Attorney-General gave me on that specific question. Yet we find that Parliament had no sooner risen than a regulation was promulgated to do the very thing he said would not be done.

It brings us to a situation where we cannot accept undertakings of that nature. I had complaints made to me, immediately the regulations were promulgated, by persons who had these amusement machines, which were in no way being used for gambling. I was presented with a copy of the regulations that were promulgated, and some reference to it appeared in the Press at the time. That is not a fair way to conduct the business of Parliament.

Mr. Brand: The police are taking action in the best interests of the people generally.

Mr. TONKIN: That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. Brand: Of course it has!

Mr. TONKIN: If it was intended that the police were going to take that action, I should have been told so.

Mr. Brand: Has it been proved they actually took that action?

Mr. TONKIN: Yes.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. W. A. Manning): The honourable member has five minutes left.

Mr. Brand: According to who?

Mr. TONKIN: According to fact. One only has to read the regulations. If the Premier doubts me I suggest he call for the regulation, and have a look at the assurance the Attorney-General gave on behalf of the Government.

Mr. Brand: I will look at the report of the police.

Mr. TONKIN: What about looking at all three? What about looking at the assurance the Attorney-General gave; and then having a look at the regulation,

and then at the police report? The Premier could then say what he thinks about my remarks. He should not just wave it off and say, "The police are doing the right thing." We all know that the police do not always do the right thing.

Mr. Brand: Have you any particular machine in mind?

Mr. TONKIN: There are various types of gambling machines and fun machines, which they call slot machines. In the case of some of them there is a gambling device where one inserts a coin and gets a reward according to the various types of machines operated. The straight-out amusement machine is one where one gets no reward at all. One puts a coin in and the machine starts to operate like a juke box which plays a tune.

The other type of machine is where one tries one's skill to see if one can get a ball into a certain position. It is a machine of skill, and the fun lies in seeing how skilful one is in operating the ball. It is very similar to the sport carried out around the Premier's electorate where people stand up and try to throw a ring on to a hook on the wall.

Mr. Brand: That is skill; but there is no skill in operating these machines.

Mr. TONKIN: What machine is the Premier talking about?

Mr. Brand: Where the ball drops down, and you have to try to catch it in a cup.

Mr. TONKIN: I suggest that the Premier, if he can spare the time one day—

Mr. Brand: I have none. I am answering your questions all the time.

Mr. TONKIN: —go down to the beach and have a look at the youngsters having fun with their 3d. and 6d. at one of these straight-out amusement machines. Many members will have seen them; but by no stretch of the imagination can they be called gambling machines.

I was given an assurance by the Attorney-General, who recognised the existence of these machines, that no action would be taken against them. But that assurance was not kept, because these machines were banned with the others. But now the shrewdies in charge of the gambling machines have defeated the Act by a device operated by someone at a bench, who starts the machine off when one's money is paid.

Mr. Brand: Have you discussed the matter with the Minister for Police?

Mr. TONKIN: No. But the Police Department has, and I daresay further legislation will be introduced and further assurances will be given and not kept.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Hart.

House adjourned at 9.48 p.m.